PRIMARY INTERVENTION IN SOCIETAL PROBLEMS: THE ROLE OF THE FAMILY, 1981

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON
AGING, FAMILY AND HUMAN SERVICES

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON
LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES
UNITED STATES SENATE

NINETY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

EXAMINATION ON THE ISSUE OF PRIMARY INTERVENTION IN ADDRESSING SOCIETAL PROBLEMS, FOCUSING ON THE CAUSES OF THE PROBLEMS AND EFFORTS TO ALLEVIATE CONDITIONS WHICH RESULT IN THE SOCIAL ILLS CONFRONTING THIS NATION

SEPTEMBER 17, 1981

❖

Printed for the use of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources

---

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
86-914 O WASHINGTON : 1981

5541-7

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

ORRIN G. HATCH, Utah, *Chairman*

ROBERT T. STAFFORD, Vermont
DAN QUAYLE, Indiana
PAULA HAWKINS, Florida
DON NICKLES, Oklahoma
LOWELL P. WEICKER, Jr., Connecticut
GORDON J. HUMPHREY, New Hampshire
JEREMIAH DENTON, Alabama
JOHN P. EAST, North Carolina

EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
JENNINGS RANDOLPH, West Virginia
HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr., New Jersey
CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island
THOMAS F. EAGLETON, Missouri
DONALD W. RIEGLE, Jr., Michigan
HOWARD M. METZENBAUM, Ohio

George W. Pritts, Jr., *Chief Counsel*
Renn M. Patch, *Staff Director and General Counsel*
Lawrence C. Horowitz, M.D., *Minority Staff Director*

Subcommittee on Aging, Family and Human Services

JEREMIAH DENTON, Alabama, *Chairman*

LOWELL P. WEICKER, Jr., Connecticut
GORDON J. HUMPHREY, New Hampshire
ORRIN G. HATCH, Utah
(Ex Officio)

THOMAS F. EAGLETON, Missouri
HOWARD M. METZENBAUM, Ohio
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
(Ex Officio)

Cynthia F. Hilton, *Professional Staff Member*
Michael J. Dyer, *Counsel*
Marcia McCord, *Minority Professional Staff Member*

CONTENTS

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF WITNESSES

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 1981

Page

Woodson, Robert L., resident fellow, American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy, Washington, D.C.; John McKnight, Center for Urban Affairs, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.; and James Garbarino, Pennsylvania State University, Department of Individual and Family Studies, University Park, Pa., a panel 4

Salk, Dr. Lee, Cornell University Medical Center, New York City 50

Symons, Sister Carol, neighborhood and family service project, Julie Community Center, Baltimore, Md.; and H. Chris Williams, president, Sun Belt Institute of Human Factors, Research & Development, Mobile, Ala., a panel 66

STATEMENTS

McKnight, John L., professor of communication studies and urban affairs and associate director, Center for Urban Affairs & Policy Research, Northwestern University, prepared statement 23

Salk, Dr. Lee, Cornell University Medical Center, New York City 50

Prepared statement 53

Sun Belt Institute of Human Factors, Research & Development, H. Chris Williams, president, prepared statement 83

Symons, Sister Carol, neighborhood and family service project, Julie Community Center, Baltimore, Md.; and H. Chris Williams, president, Sun Belt Institute of Human Factors, Research & Development, Mobile, Ala., a panel 66

Prepared statement 68

Woodson, Robert L., resident fellow, American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy, Washington, D.C.; John McKnight, Center for Urban Affairs, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.; and James Garbarino, Pennsylvania State University, Department of Individual and Family Studies, University Park, Pa., a panel 4

Prepared statement 7

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Articles, publications, etc.:

"Latchkey Children—Getting the Short End of the Stick" by James Garbarino, from Vital Issues, Vol. XXX, No. 3 31

Questions and answers:

Responses of James Garbarino, Pennsylvania State University, to questions asked by Senator Hatch 36

Responses of Dr. Lee Salk, Cornell Medical Center, New York City to questions asked by Senator Denton 61

PRIMARY INTERVENTION IN SOCIETAL PROBLEMS: THE ROLE OF THE FAMILY, 1981

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 1981

U.S SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGING, FAMILY, AND HUMAN SERVICES,
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, in room 4232 Dirksen Senate Office Building, commencing at 9:37 a.m., Senator Jeremiah Denton (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Senator Denton.

Staff present: Cynthia Hilton and Michael Dyer, professional staff members.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR DENTON

Senator DENTON. Good morning. This hearing of the Subcommittee on Aging, Family and Human Services will come to order.

Allow me to welcome all of our distinguished witnesses who will be testifying for us today. I am pleased to be chairing today the second in a series of hearings which the subcommittee will be conducting on the issue of primary intervention in addressing societal problems. The concept of primary intervention relates to the etiology or causes of problems with an aim toward prevention rather then taking a strictly remedial approach.

It is my hope that we can focus on various units within our social structure to determine the role they play and how best to support these units in efforts to alleviate conditions which result in the social ills confronting this Nation.

In our first hearing of this series, which was held in Montgomery, Ala., 3 weeks ago, the subcommittee examined the general area of private initiative and public assistance in fighting poverty. At that hearing I heard testimony which indicated that Federal social welfare policies have had both positive and negative implications. On the positive side the Federal programs of public assistance have succeeded in significantly reducing poverty. On the other hand, many of these programs tend to foster dependence by providing little or no incentive for moving out of the system.

I am reminded of the allegory, which I mentioned in Montgomery, that if you give a hungry person a fish, that person will return to you again and again to receive a fish when he becomes hungry. However, if you give him a hook and a line and teach him how to fish, he will become self-sufficient.

I believe that this is applicable to social policy. There is a corallary to this, of course; if the individual is helpless, unable to help himself, then there is nothing to do but give him or her a fish, and we should do that with love in our hearts.

Several witnesses at our Alabama hearing referred in a general fashion to the impact of public assistance on the family. We may in our society be overlooking to our great peril the fact that the family is the irreplacable production and processing unit for the development of responsible citizens and socially harmonious individuals. The importance of the family cannot be underestimated. In an effort to sharpen our knowledge, we will target this issue more closely today.

I do not mean to say by that that a great man or woman cannot come from an environment which involves no father or mother. It's possible, but for society as a whole, or for the Nation as a whole, the general rule has to prevail that the family in its traditional, historic, realistic function is the place where responsible citizens and socially harmonious individuals are formed. The schools and Government programs cannot replace that social unit.

Much of the social dysfunction that plagues our society can be traced to some dysfunction within the family. For example, alcoholism, drug abuse, juvenile delinquency and sometimes even the failure to break the poverty cycle itself may find their roots in a somehow deficient family relationship. Aside from familial influence, children today are bombarded with conflicting moral values in an increasingly permissive society. Parents are likewise confused by double standards or no standards at all.

At times, parents may find their responsibility preempted by some governmental policies which, in the name of welfare or public assistance, actually erode the self-dignity of many recipients.

No one questions the motivation behind most of these Federal social programs. However, in an effort to remedy identified problems, these programs can come to be administered in a manner which damages family structure.

In other words, the program can start one way, the administration of it is okay, the motivation of it is okay, and over the period of 10 years with evolution within the administration, because of the bureaucrats and functionaries carrying it out, it can become a very distorted version of what it was in the first place. This is really something to be avoided.

Programs which directly or indirectly replace functions traditionally performed by the family tend to diminish the self-image of the family. The loss of stature in these individual instances may become generalized so that parents feel inadequate as providers, educators, counsellors, and role models.

I don't mean to say that only Government programs tend to tarnish this self-image. Most of our popular magazines and television programs, with the slant in journalism, in my opinion, tends to diminish the prestige, the supreme importance of the role of husband and wife, mother, and father.

I think this causes youth to feel terrific peer pressure regarding the roles they play in life, how they play them, and this is to the detriment of the general welfare.

Economic pressures are growing to crisis proportions for many families. How many parents must work in order to provide basic necessities, or how many are required to work in order to provide a standard of living which the family chooses to establish as a necessary standard which may be above the level of mere necessity? How many single parent households are in the same situation? Some of these parents can not even afford to pay for child care services while they are working. Their children have to fend for themselves after school until their parents get off work. Both children and parents in such a situation may find themselves burdened with additional anxiety.

We in the Congress are in a real dilemma. Social welfare programs now consume more than 50 percent of the entire Federal budget. Outlays for these programs have more than tripled in the last 10 years rising from $104.6 billion in 1972 to $364.2 billion in 1982. Yet it is largely uncontrolled Government spending that spawns an unstable economy, which causes a great deal of the problem. It decreases the purchasing power causing businesses to go bankrupt, reducing the number of jobs available, and forcing more families into tight financial straits. We must find a method of appropriately helping individuals, families, and communities to return to some measure of self-sufficiency.

This is necessary for two reasons. First, the economy can no longer sustain waste in programs. We must design programs that are cost-effective and outcome-effective. I have said repeatedly before that a bankrupt country can do nothing for its poor and our national debt will soon exceed $1 trillion. We can not only do nothing for our poor but for any of our citizens when we reach that point.

Second, we must not undermine the fundamental primary unit that has always served as the cornerstone of all society. Some sort of redirection to support the family must be accomplished so that it can again realize its full potential.

I am somewhat amazed that despite adversity, the family usually has the capability to adapt. However, this adversity is intensifying and the pressures are becoming greater.

I am anxious to hear the testimony of our witnesses today on their analysis of the situation as well as what is actually being done now and what can be done in the future to help reaffirm the family as a primary support unit within our society.

Our first panelists are Robert Woodson, resident fellow, American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy. I would ask that he come forward. Also Dr. John McKnight, Center for Urban Affairs, and Dr. James Garbarino, of the Pennsylvania State University, Department of Individual and Family Studies, Pennsylvania State University. Dr. Garbarino, I might say that I think that the Penn State-Alabama game this year would be a rather significant one for the latter institution. Welcome, gentlemen.

Our format will be that each witness on the panel will present five minutes of oral testimony and after each of you have presented your opening statements the subcommittee will direct questions to each of you.

Mr. Woodson, would you kindly proceed.

STATEMENTS OF ROBERT L. WOODSON, RESIDENT FELLOW, AMERICAN ENTERPRISE INSTITUTE FOR PUBLIC POLICY, WASHINGTON, D.C.; JOHN McKNIGHT, CENTER FOR URBAN AFFAIRS, NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY, EVANSTON, ILL.; AND JAMES GARBARINO, PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY DEPARTMENT OF INDIVIDUAL AND FAMILY STUDIES, UNIVERSITY PARK, PA., A PANEL

Mr. Woodson. Thank you, Senator. The views I am about to present are my own and do not necessarily represent those of the American Enterprise Institute. I have been in residence there about 5 years and I am involved in a very exciting study on the role of intermediary institutions in public policy.

Our immediate and specific concern and attention has been directed to a review of programs that have been developed to help the poor in this country, and what can be done positively as an alternative to these programs.

As you indicated, Senator, we have experienced a tremendous increase in the amount of money spent to address the programs of the poor. The problem seems to be getting worse. We have to ask ourselves, then, what is being done that is creating this situation. We think we have come up with some of the answers.

In reviewing the literature, talking to people around the country and conducting some of our own studies, we have found that when poor people living in neighborhoods throughout this country need help, the first seven people they turn to in times of crisis and trouble are their friends, relatives, their church, people within their own community. The last person they turn to—the eighth person—is a professional person, the professional service provider.

In spite of this reality, that people turn to those natural helping networks, public policy tends to deliver resources to the institution or individual of last choice of people in need. As a result, we have a network of professional interests that profits from the existence of poverty, from professional programs and from the disorganization of these families.

Many of them, of course, are of noble intent. They are compassionate people, but, as a friend and colleague of mine said, compassion is not what one feels, compassion is a consequence of actions that are taken.

What I have discovered is that much of what is done in the name of the poor is being done to assist them, but much is in fact exacerbating the very problems the aid was designed to solve. They are giving help with some very devastating results that represent an assault on the family, an assault on these mediating institutions. What we have got to do—what we have attempted to do at AEI—is to examine the positive things that these mediating institutions do, the functions they perform, the kind of problems they solve, and ask ourselves, if they are as effective as they appear to be, then why do they continue to be ignored by public policymakers and service providers?

We think we have come up with some answers. We have found for instance, to illustrate our point, that the combined Federal-State-local expenditures are about $2 billion annually to care for children away from their homes.

In the foster care system we have roughly 500,000 to 700,000 youngsters being cared for by an industry that through this funding has perverse incentives for children to live away from home and from their stable families. No matter how compassionate a professional provider might be, he cannot substitute for a loving home. Yet we have a situation where children come into child care for a limited period of time, supposedly, and many of them languish for 10 or 15 years at a cost of $10,000 per child per year.

Moreover, only 3 to 5 percent of these youngsters, upon coming into care, come in as a consequence of any disturbance in their own life. It is the family breakdown. The current policy forbids paying support to a family member or person in extending the family, but instead perversely pays more to care for children in the home of a stranger, rather than providing aid within the context of the family.

For instance, the current reimbursement rate for a child being cared for away from the family is $17 a day in foster care; $40 a day in a group home; $80 a day in an institution. In the city of Washington, D.C., we have virtually hundreds of youngsters, infants, and those below the age of 6 years, being cared for in an institutional setting at a cost of $80 a day. There are four youngsters in this area in psychiatric care institutions at a cost of $100,000 per child per year. There is no cap on that. There is no limit actually.

In many of the agencies that we study, 80 percent of the moneys being spent for these children do not go to the home or to the care of children. They go to support overhead, salaries, and services of these agencies.

So no matter how compassionate these agencies are, there is absolutely no incentive for those children to be returned to their homes.

We are told, for instance, that the reason we have this backlog of children, particularly the 50 percent of them who are minorities, is that minority people are unable to adopt or unwilling to adopt these children because they are hard to place, they are older, some are handicapped and some are just beyond the age of 3.

This is absolutely false and misleading, because thousands and thousands of people have indicated according to our studies that they are willing to take handicapped children, retarded children, older children, but they are prevented from taking these children because of the eligibility requirements established by the agencies. The professional service providers themselves determine what constitutes an acceptable family.

In some cases an executive making $60,000 a year who has a wooden leg is not qualified.

We have people rejected because they are overweight, or if the age difference between the prospective adoptee and adoptive parent is large the agency rejects them. Often low income people are rejected because of income. They are asked questions about their prior sexual activity, their religion. All sorts of barriers are erected that keep children, hundreds of children who are in need, thousands of children in need, from families who want them, and this is being continued by an industry that profits as a consequence of this condition. This is just one area.

I won't go on, but I could make the case also in the juvenile justice system and many other areas of human services delivery. So in conclusion, I think we have got to understand that the first responsibility of public policy is to do no harm. The second responsibility is to explore less expensive and more effective and more efficient private sector alternatives that provide a stable home for a child and work toward making greater use of these mediating institutions that are now ignored by public policymakers.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Woodson follows:]

TESTIMONY

PRIMARY INTERVENTION IN THE SOCIETAL PROBLEM: MEDIATING STRUCTURES AND CHILD WELFARE

Presented by:

Robert L. Woodson, Resident Fellow
American Enterprise Institute for
Public Policy Research

Presented to:

Senate Subcommittee on Aging, Family and Human Services

September 17, 1981

The views I am about to present are my own and do not necessarily represent those of the American Enterprise Institute, where I am currently in residence.

The defunding of many human service programs has focused attention on the concept of "mediating structures" as an alternative to professional intervention in personal problems. We are now reconsidering the use of a natural social resource once taken for granted--the good will and concern of relatives and friends who could be called on in time of need.

Long before government assumed responsibility for delivery of human services, families and friends would rally to care for neighbors in some trouble. People in need would turn to each other, to their church or to other neighborhood gorups.

Sociologists identify these primary helpers as "mediating structures," in view of the social functions they perform. Mediating structures are groups intermediate between the individual and the large, powerful, impersonal social order. Such intermediate structures function to protect the individual socially and psychologically, at the same time that they represent his needs and rights in the society at large more effectively than he can alone. These familiar groups and neighborhood people are still the helpers overwhelmingly preferred, as two independent studies of urban poor confirm. The professional service worker is only consulted as a last resort.

Government has, never the less, assumed more and more responsibility for social services a society has grown more complex. But somehow this government action has not augmented neighborhood initiatives. It tends to supplant them. Functions of mediating structures have been progressively displaced into impersonal, professional agencies.

At issue in the recent concern for alternatives to agency help has been the high cost per benefit of bureaucratic services. But more importantly, the formal, impersonal organization is, on the record, simply unable to develop the sensitivity and mutual loyalty with clients that made families and neighborhood people able to function as effective helpers. The result is a legacy of high cost, uneven helpfulness and even downright injury to clients.

Where the population to be served is our children, the

the casual harm done by professional service delivery should be a matter of paramount concern to us. It is the record of this harm and the promise of a revial of the mediating structure approach to child welfare that I want to discuss. Professional services to children are simply not operating in a context with qualities of family life, however sincere the worker. In areas of juvenile justice, foster care and adoption, evidence of the inverse effect of our theoretical good-will amounts to a scandal.

CHILD WELFARE SERVICES: FOSTER CARE, ADOPTION AND JUVENILE JUSTICE

Research documents and conventional wisdom accepts that prolonged institutionalization of a child, to say nothing of incarceration, injures and disorganizes his normal psycho-social development. Official policy is to move children quickly out of containing institutions--out of jails into rehabilitation programs, out of group homes and foster care into permanent homes. Yet the evidence shows that neither child welfare agencies nor authorities in juvenile justice are actually responding to this priority.

In child care agencies, for example, efforts to provide adoptive permanence for children are severly limited. Some children wait five to ten years for a home. The overwhelming majority spend childhood moving through a series of foster homes and institutions at enormous costs to the public. It is a permanent way of life to them, not the temporary haven it is supposed to be. Once public care begins, adoption is routinely discouraged and the predicted personality dislocations set in. Not surprisinly, the child is soon relabled "unadoptable." Too many kids who find their way into the juvenile justice system have already spent time in foster care.

Money for care of child wards is often diverted. One agency accumulated a multi-million dollar stock portfolio while spending as little as $2.96 a day per child to feed and clothe their wards. Since they received $24,000 a year for each child in care, the suspicion is unavoidable that adoption is less attractive to the child keepers than is keeping the income the child brings in. In a typical recent year, four homes were given $6 million to place 2,000 children and placed only ten.

Children who need homes and families eager for children don't learn about each other. Inquiries are discouraged and an anti-family bias shapes decisions by the agency staff. Applicants for a child are too old, too young, too poor, too fat, single, the wrong religion or, in ways to numerous to count, rejectable.

Efforts to return children to natural parents are also severaly limited. Visiting your child in "temporary" care is made difficult and natural parents and children become estranged. Many parents are too poor to keep traveling to visit their children. Meanwhile, the hurt and rejection experienced by children is unrequited. The child ward is abandoned psychologically and literally by the public systems that take over responsibility for him.

There is no check on the quality of services to children and no cross-system monitor of practies. Large case loads and voluminous paper work assure that workers have no time to know the children decided about, nor to maintain contact with families. Workers are unprepared to deal with family problems. In any case, even a well run institution isn't a family or a home.

In happy contrast to this typical picture is a mediating structure approach called Homes for Black Chilren in Detroit. A black community organization, conducted almost totally by volunteers, with minimal financial resources, has in a single year placed in permanent, loving homes over three times more black children than had been placed in adoption that year by all thirteen agencies reporting to the United Community Services of Metropolitan Detroit.

The poor adoption rate of the profession overall is even more troubling when we consider the usual service to black children. Out of every fifteen adoptions, only one is of a black child, even though at least sixty percent of the children freed for adoption are black. The agencies' claim that black

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

families don't adopt is directly contradicted by the success of Homes for Black Children. Homes for Black Children succeeds as a true advocate of the child's interests because of great sensitivity to the culture and feelings of both children and prospective parents.

Juvenile Justice System

The performance of the juvenile justice system reveals the same pattern of inertia, self-interest and careless harm to young people who come under its authority.

Diversion and deinstitutionalization of young offenders has been strongly urged to prevent the injury inherent in incarceration. Yet even the father of the diversion policy, Edwin Lemert, openly admits it has failed, because in fact no one has been diverted. The institutional tradition and staff interest invested in the system take precedence over the welfare of its clients.

This is what happened. From the start, diversion quickly took on the carnival aspect of a bait and switch game. Child advocates tried to raise money for alternatives to jail by citing statistics on the rising rate of serious youth crime, to indicate the urgent need. With horror stories about the worst index offenders, government and private donors were baited to give, but when the money appeared, the serious offender was ruled out of any new programs. In a quiet switch behind scenes, programs were created to include a new polulation altogether.

For example, in 1972 the State of Florida won an award from the National Council on Crime and Delinquency for having the most community based alternative beds for juvenile delinquents. But in that same year that 1,000 alternative beds were funded, the state training school population didn't drop by one. No one was deinstitutionalized. All they did was grab 1,000 kids previously on probation at home and put them in half-way houses, spreading the control of the system at great public expense and, incidentally, in no way disturbing the people whose jobs rely on the continued use of secure lock-up for youth.

In New York when the transit police received funds for an alternative program for delinquent offenders, when a drop in the supply of eligible youth threatened the funding, police began to arrest almost anybody. Kids guilty of turnstile jumping in the subway or of minor nuisances were charged as multiple offenders by escalating the definitions of what they had done, thus making them eligible for the program.

Lemert has called this common practice "net widening." Definitions of cases and offenses are manipulated to protect funding and jobs of staffers. With money available for diversion, personnel began to suck in youths who would have been ignored previously, thus decreasing diversion. More offenders are classified as "detainable" after the program is set up than before and fewer are released to parents. There is also an increase in arbitrary discretion exercised by police and probation people. Associated with funding for diversion and jail alternatives, police power has extended now over youth and types of behavior not previously subject to control. Thus more than one worth while objective has been defeated, but the greatest harm is to the children.

The callous tie-in between practice and funding is well understood by workers in this field. Once when a D.C. judge tried to work overtime to clear his docket of juvenile cases, so that the jail time for youth awaiting court response could be shortened, the administrator of the jail called back in anger, "What are you trying to do," he complained. "If this keeps up, I'll have to fire staff."

Lemert also confirms the "bait and switch" associated with funding for professional services to youth offenders. Programs set up regularly "cream off" the easiest young people to work with, while those guilty of serious crime--those the money was raised to help--are labeled unfit for the program and locked up, remaining untreated and fully exposed to the self-destroying experiences of jail. Meanwhile, in ignorance of this, the general public believes everything possible is being done to rehabilitate offenders. When youth crime and recidivism remain high, a belief is fostered that "nothing can be done" and public pressure mounts for tougher sentences and lesser legal protections for the rights of the accused.

Between "creaming" and "net-widening," all the purposes of diversion have been perverted. The system has been realigned so that the interests of its staff continue to take precedence over societal interest in the welfare of children. Moreover, even as public programs try to handle only light weight people who would probably get better anyway, reaserch is still unable to show any consistent, significant relation between any type of professional program and the subsequent behavior of any type of offender. The young person who needs inspiration and remotivation simply can't find himself or change himself in the impersonal context of public care.

One thoughtful professional told me with regret, "I have become a charlatan, living off people who don't need me and neglecting the needy I can't help anyway."

But children in trouble with the law can be helped. In the urban centers of this country there already exist groups giving youth care that offer striking confirmation of the theory that a mediating structure can be more effective, more appropriate and much less costly as a means to help. These urban groups are made up of people who are neighbors to the youth they serve, with a shared sub-culture. These are groups held together and motivated by the same kinds of ties that characterize families. The success of their work can be direcctly attributed to the extended family type of atmosphere with which they surround their young people.

The House of Umoja in Philadelphia is a family home for youth gangs and street kids. Umoja grew out of the personal concern of one black mother, Sister Falaka Fattah, for her own son and for her neighbors' children who were in the gangs at a time when Philadelphia was famous as the gang warfare capital of the world. She has taken into her home and made a family out of the roughest of the rough, the kids regarded by professionals as so violent and dangerous they are unfit for anything but the lock-up. Now, professional people in the area acknowledge that the dramatic drop in youth homicides and gang violence in West Philadelphia is due to the House of Umoja program. Umoja was self-funded through most of its existence and still struggles along at a fraction of the cost of the typical professional agency.

In La Playa de Ponce, Puerto Rico, is a similar neighborhood program in which the mediating structure concept is at work. Charles Silberman, after an intensive five year research into American juvenile justice, praised this program as the best he's seen anywhere in our system.*

Other programs, operating on the same principle, are spontaneously appearing in other cities--in Los Angeles, in New York, Hartford, Connecticut, St. Louis, Chester, Pennsylvania, to name a few. These programs also deal effectively with a variety of community problems besides youth crime.

---

* Charles E. Silberman, Criminal Violence, Criminal Justice, New York: Vintage Books, 1980.

The irony of these programs is that they operate outside the mainstream and are either unknown or rejected by professional people responsible for developing alternatives to child-harming institutionalization.

In recent federal suit concerning the state schools in Puerto Rico, which are horrifying places, one of the plaintiffs was a child who was allowed to die in an isolation cell as trial preparations dragged on. Yet not many miles away on that small island is one of the finer alternative programs in the world, the program at La Playa de Ponce.

CONCLUSION

We mustn't underrate the ability of professionals to deal with serious problems. A real issue, however, is who decides when a professional is needed? It seems in many cases our children may have been in the wrong hands. We have a sellers' market now, in that professionals themselves decide when, to whom and how they serve. The result too often is the paradox of careless care. The most qualified professionals refuse to deal with the neediest cases, the least qualified deal ineffectively, in the worst client-staff ratios, with the most difficult cases. Perhaps the man was right who said, "Professionals should be on tap, not on top." Professional control over the means of societal help should not become an ideology. We have an effective alternative in the mediating structures approach.

These are some of the facts we should keep in mind as policy toward youth service delivery is debated. First, to empower a class of trained specialists as social helpers is also to generate a class of client dependents in whom helpers themselves define the so-called deficiencies that call for help. In this system, clients and helpers remain forever unequals and outsiders to each other. In turn, help that presupposes a deficient client undermines the self-respect and positive initiatives of the client and generally exacerbates his problems. The professional social structure simply has no qualities of family life, no matter how sincere the worker. The urban minorities and poor, the target population of much social service, testify that this dependent status is inherently undesirable.

Professionally conceived and publically funded social help also generates a helper industry that, unlike a business, is not supported by the buyers of its product. Accordingly, having no partcular accountability to its clients, it operates in the seller's market mentioned. This means difficult cases can be

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

rejected for service and clients served can be neglected at best and positively injured at worst. Since professionals control also the criteria of professional success and the definitions of its categories of clients and their needs, professional services can survive any malfeasance and continue in business, unlike a friendship, a family or even a true market enterprise.

The self-perpetuating service industry also perversely perpetuates and extends the very problems it purports to solve. The presence of public money for service, where service delivery is though an impersonal agency, provides an incentive to keep people in need, and a disincentive to solve social problem conditions that generate clients. Moreover, as we see, service workers can be founnd actively extending their own control through manipulating treatment and categories of the treated at the expense of those exposed to their help. In effect, public funds underwrite an industry that benefits staffers at the expense of their clients, and "the helping hand strikes again."

In bureaucratic agencies, intention, practice and consequences are out of touch with each other. Good intention is joined to malpractice through the play of agency interests to produce the unforseen worsening of conditions, facts with special poignancy where children are victims.

In contrast, the sensitivity and effectiveness of the mediating structures approach is being demonstrated daily in our urban communities. The low cost of such care alone warrants our consideration and support for such efforts.

Senator **Denton**. Thank you very much, Mr. Woodson.

Dr. McKnight.

Mr. **McKnight**. Senator, I appreciate being here. Your staff has elevated me in my status. I am Mr. McKnight, not "Doctor."

Senator **Denton**. You are "Mr.", OK. Go right ahead.

Mr. **McKnight**. I have given a full statement but because of the time, let me excerpt a few points that seem to me to be most critical.

Senator **Denton**. We will be using both your written and your oral opening statments in consideration for our findings, you can rest assured of that.

Mr. **McKnight**. I want to stress that families exist in a universe.

Incidentally, it's very important to listen how people talk about families when they come here. Are they talking about a family as though that family is a discrete unit that somehow can be made to do something, treated to do something. Or, do they see that family as a part of a social context.

I agree with much of what Mr. Woodson says and my guess is that the industry he talks about depends on understanding the family as a discrete isolated treatable entity, and once you remove that understanding then I think you can begin to talk sense about the American family and it's on that point that I will focus.

Families exist in a universe. They are surrounded by other bodies that make up the interrelated system necessary for the family to work. These bodies are the neighborhood organization, civic club, ethnic organization, local political club, family business, local union, church or temple and thousands of informal groups. Here I am talking mostly about cities, larger cities, because that is the focus of our work. It is this universe that gets much of the work of America done. It is this universe that provides the gravity that holds America on course as our great institution and their systems increasingly fluctuate, wobble, veer, and, I'm afraid, fail. It is this universe that has inseparable parts. To injure one element is to injure all. It is also this universe, we would like to argue, that has been under systematic if unintentional assault for years as a result of the policies of Democratic and Republican administrations, conservative and liberal legislators.

At the family level you can see the results, such as the neighborhood savings institution beginning to take all the neighborhood savings deposits and investing in the growth of suburbia, and thus a part of that family universe is dying. As the community schools become centralized and their purposes are defined by professionals, a part of the family universe is dying. As Government advantages large corporations and the uncompetitive neighborhood enterprises collapse a part of the family is dying. As doctors, lawyers, social workers, teachers, counsellors, and therapists are funded to provide more and more services, the functions of the local civic and ethnic associations and churches atrophy and another part of the family universe is dead. As television replaces the local political club as the vehicle for selecting our representatives, a part of the family universe dies, and finally the family is alone, a sun with no planets, burning out.

The basis for an economy for family survival—the authority, tools, skill, capital—are being taken away. Now, the family in the inner city often stands alone. Therefore, if you wish to reverse the present trends and support the family universe as the working center of America there are three policy directions that I think are appropriate.

The first is to eliminate those policies that disempower the family and its universe. Second is to insure a legitimate, protected space for the family universe so it has an opportunity to compete with the huge monopolistic corporate, service, and bureaucratic structures.

Senator DENTON. Would you read that second one again, please?

Mr. McKNIGHT. To insure a legitimate, protected space for the family universe so it has an opportunity to compete with the huge monopolistic corporate, service, and bureaucratic structures.

Third, provide interim economic support for survival of family and neighborhood life especially in our inner cities. We hven't the time to detail the options these policies suggest, however I would like to give a few brief examples in each area. First on policies that disempower the family universe. Government policies are replete with programs that promote the division of families by age. This is most vivid in the case of the elderly where public programs encourage care by institutions rather than families. This process is described in detail in my attached paper titled "The Need for Oldness." We need a new program for age integration if the family is to survive.

Many Government programs are also injurious because they allocate massive resources to professionals who basically see the family as a client in need of treatment and therapy. The result has been disastrous in two ways. First, as Mr. Woodson says, the service professionals have the increasing effect of convincing families that they are incompetent to know, care, teach, cure, make or do.

Second, the professional servicers take increasing proportions of public money, desparately needed by the poor, and consume it in the name of helping the poor.

In one Chicago neighborhood, for example, for every $1 received in cash income by a person who is forced on welfare, professional medical carers alone receive 50 cents. This is only one professional service financed by Government to treat rather than empower the poor.

We need a radical new policy that reexamines these service transfer payments in terms of their potential to promote new investment for competence. At the very least, poor families ought to have a choice of income or prepaid doctors who cost one-third of their income.

Insuring a legitimate space for the family universe, I know this is not a common idea, but you see if this explains it. There is a social and economic context, space necessary to insure the working capacity of the family universe. We can all understand how professionals invade that space, disempower by coming there and making it their turf, their jurisdiction.

But we don't understand so well that other institutions do the same thing. Our public policy is biased against that context, against that space by favoring large-scale corporations to the disadvantage of small-scale family and neighborhood enterprises as well as the small family farm.

Incidentally, people tell me when I say that that well, that's progress. I wonder whether they really think that is true. It appears this administration, like its recent predecessors, sees the economy of the family as a trickle down beneficiary of large-scale production. I think in our view that policy has failed and it will continue to fail. Our cities are filled with desparate families unneeded by our corporate systems of production. But those families can make a life and renew our cities if you will allow and enable new tools and transfer authority so we can enfranchise families to produce rather than consume; to be the center of making rather than holding a cup to catch the trickles down from the great corporate and professional service systems. If you want to empower families, why not hold hearings on neighborhood economy, tools for community production, legal authority to create local energy management corporations, and to enhance family enterprises?

Third, providing interim economic support for the survival of family life. Out in our neighborhood in Chicago, until these first two policy initiatives are taken many of our families will be forced to stand alone and they really do depend on Government money to survive.

Now, in the neighborhoods we are good at surviving. That's the greatest skill of our families. We have eaten lots of rice to fill our stomachs. We know the taste of dog food. We've worn old clothes for years. We stand in line for everything. We have lots of time. It's a very bad life but with our family we survive and it's an old story. But what is new and what's absolutely outrageous to hear is our new Government telling us that we have to tighten our belt, accuses us of cheating, suggest we're lazy and then ask why the family isn't strong.

Many of our isolated families will be forced to take new measures to survive in the face of the current attack on the real income of the poor family. Therefore, in neighborhood after neighborhood we see the economy of last resort developing, the drug industry building its market system in the vacuum created by a Government that puts urban neighborhoods last, poor families at the end of the line.

I want to close by stressing that in the neighborhoods in our larger older midwestern cities where I have my experience, where I've worked for 25 years with neighborhood organizations, the leaders and organizers of those neighborhoods each day for the last I would say 2 years have bent over and over saying, "John, for the first time we're losing; the economy of the drug industry is taking over."

I submit that that industry as an economic base for a neighborhood is a disaster that is hard for me to even conceive undoing and it's happening because our great institutions have stolen the resources and abandoned those neighborhoods and the people who are there. But they have to survive and the new emphasis on cutting back, when that cutback reaches into the pockets of the poor, I would say it's an absolute consequence, that is, the growth of drug dependency of a new kind which is economic dependency on the drug industry.

[The prepared statement of Mr. McKnight follows:]

Testimony of John L. McKnight, Professor of
Communication Studies and Urban Affairs and
Associate Director, Center for Urban Affairs
and Policy Research at Northwestern University
before the Senate Subcommittee on Aging, Family
and Human Services, September 17, 1981

I appreciate this opportunity to appear before the Subcommittee on Aging, Family and Human Services. In the brief time available I would like to focus upon two views of the family and the policy implications of each. My particular emphasis will be upon lower income families residing in our large cities because it is these families and the neighborhoods where they reside that are the focus of much of the research of the Center for Urban Affairs and Policy Research where I am employed.

One hears, in the language of America, two views of the family. The first view is expressed by the voices from our major institutions in the profit, not-for-profit and governmental sectors. They speak of families as "markets," "producing baby booms," "in need of being strengthened," and "having demographic patterns demonstrating various needs." This language is used by those who see families as small groups of related consumers and clients. One hears this language most frequently in the Board rooms of our major corporations, the staff meetings of our service agencies and the hearing rooms of legislatures. This common language demonstrates the uniformity of the institutional view of the family. Family is to buy. Family is to use. Family is to consume. Family is to be helped. Family is to be treated. And family is to provide effective workers and soldiers for the maintenance of the institutions.

The second view of the family is expressed in the voices we hear in the older neighborhoods of Chicago and our other great cities. There, families are the place where you are, from which you come, and to which you will return. Families are about survival. Families make, do, make-do, produce, solve, celebrate and, sometimes, fail. Families also exist in a special universe. They are surrounded by other bodies that make up the interrelated system necessary for the family to work. These bodies are the neighborhood organization, civic club, ethnic organization, local political club, family business, local union, church or temple and thousands of informal groups. It is this universe that gets much of the work of America done. It is this universe that provides the gravity that holds America on course as our great institutions and their systems increasingly fluctuate, wobble, veer, and fail. It is this universe that has inseparable parts. To injure one element is to injure all. It is also this universe, we would like to argue, that has been under systematic if unintentional assault for years as a result of the policies of Democratic and Republican administrations, conservative and liberal legislators.

The reason for this common assault is that in our country, the language, logic and legislation of our leaders reflects a debate about which institutional sector will have more power over the family and its universe. Will more power go to those who use families as markets for goods; more to those who use families as clients; more to those who use families as revenue producers or soldiers? Who will get to use the family and its universe. Which of them will have more power?

Viewed from our neighborhoods in Chicago, the family and its related organizations are the center of life. Large scale institutions could be supportive. Instead they generally dominate and take power away from the family center. Indeed, in some few areas they have been victorious. There, families have become almost nothing but clients and consumers without the money, tools or authority to survive. poverty is the direct result of the empowerment of the giant systems that compete in these halls over control of our lives and the universe in which we live. From the viewpoint of these systems, families are not the center of society - they are the end of a pipeline, at the bottom of some institution's organization chart of society.

As policymakers, your effect upon the family universe will be determined by your view of the world. If the family is at the end of a pipeline, if you serve only to empower those who control pipelines, you will inevitably weaken the family.

On the other hand, if you wish to support the family universe as the working center of America, there are three basic policy directions that are appropriate. First, eliminate policies that disempower the family universe. Second, insure a legitimate, protected space for the family universe so it has an opportunity to compete with the huge monopolistic corporate, service and bureaucratic structures. Third, affirmatively support the economy of family and neighborhood life.

We haven't the time to go into detail regarding the options these policies suggest. However, we would at least like to provide brief examples in each area.

1. Policies that disempower the family universe.

   Government policies are replete with programs that promote the division of families by age. This is most vivid in the case of the elderly where public programs encourage care by institutions rather than families. This process is described in detail in my attached paper titled "The Need for Oldness."

   Many government programs are also injurious because they allocate massive resources to professionals who basically see the family as a client in need of treatment and therapy. The result has been disastrous in two ways. First, the service professionals have the increasing effect of convincing families that they are incompetent to know, care, teach, cure, make or do. Only certified experts can do that for you.

Second, the professional servicers take increasing proportions of public money, desperately needed by the poor, and consume it in the name of helping poor families. In one Chicago neighborhood, for example, for every $1.00 received in cash income by a person forced on welfare, professional medical carers receive 50 cents. This is only one professional service financed by government to treat rather than empower the poor. We need a radical new policy that reexamines these service transfer payments in terms of their potential to promote new investment for competence. At the very least, poor families ought to have a choice of income or prepaid doctors equal to half their income.

2. Insuring a legitimate space for the family universe.

   There is a social and economic context that will insure the working capacity of the family universe. Our public policy is biased against that context by favoring large scale corporations to the disadvantage of small scale family and neighborhood enterprises as well as the small family farm. It appears that this administration, like its recent predecessors, sees the economy of the family as a trickle down beneficiary of large scale production. A Congress seriously concerned about family and production would begin to reexamine what we make and how we make it. Our cities are filled with desperate families unneeded by our corporate systems of production. But those families can make a life and renew our cities if you will allow and enable new tools and transfer authority so we can enfranchise families to produce rather than consume; to be the center of making rather than holding a cup to catch the trickles down from the great corporate and professional service systems. If you want to empower families, why not hold hearings on neighborhood economy, tools for community production, legal authority to create local energy management corporations?

3. Supporting the economy of family life.

   In our older, inner city neighborhoods, families are the survival centers. If the entire universe around the family is strong, the family will do its job. But as the universe weakens, the family fights a losing battle. As the neighborhood savings institution begins to take all of the neighborhood savings and invest in the growth of suburbia, a part of the family universe dies. As the community schools become centralized and

> their purposes defined by professionals, a part of the family universe dies. As government advantages large corporations and the "uncompetitive" neighborhood enterprise collapses, a part of the family universe dies. As doctors, lawyers, social workers, teachers, counsellors and therapists are funded to provide more and more services, the functions of the local civic and ethnic associations and churches atrophy and representative neighborhood associations are often corrupted by becoming "end of the pipeline" vehicles for professionals who deliver services. A part of the family universe is dead. As television replaces the local political club as the vehicle for selecting our representatives, a part of the family universe dies. Finally, the family is alone - a sun with no planets, burning out.
>
> The basis for an economy for family survival - the authority, tools, skill, capital - are being taken away. Now, the family in the inner city often stands alone. Therefore, there are two basic policy issues regarding those families.
>
> First, are we, are you, prepared to remove the restraints and provide the protections to allow the family universe a central place in our society? To do so will require a new breed of elected representatives because we, the family and its constituent groups, have no real lobbies. Those who have taken our power and authority have loud voices here in Washington. They represent the great corporations, the great professions, the great bureaucracies. We wonder, out in Chicago, out in the neighborhoods, at the corner of Kedzie and Madison whether anyone here can even hear us.
>
> Second, until you act, if you do act, to allow or enhance the universe and economy essential to families, many of us will stand alone and depend on government money to survive. We are good at surviving. That is the greatest skill of our families. We have eaten lots of rice to fill ourselves up. We know the taste of dog food. We've worn your old clothes for years. We stand in line for everything. We have time. It's often a very bad life - but with our family, we survive. Our family is strong.
>
> What is new, what is absolutely outrageous is to hear our new government telling us we have to tighten our belt, accuse us of cheating, suggest we're lazy and then ask why the family isn't strong.

The survival of millions of low income American families in the heart of America's cities is the ultimate proof that the center, the strength, the reality of America is built on the family. There has been an assault on this family. Now, there is a full scale war hidden in euphemisms of "belt tightening" and calls for "across the board sacrifices".

Many of our isolated families will be forced to take new measures to survive in the face of the current attack on the real income of the poor family. Therefore, in neighborhood after neighborhood, we see the economy of last resort developing - the drug industry building its market system in the vacuum created by a government that puts urban neighborhoods last, poor families at the end.

Families in our city neighborhoods are weakened because the professions want them as deficient clients, corporations want them as consumers while rejecting them as workers, and the government insists they live without a decent income. We are in desperate need of a pro-family policy, a policy that places the family universe at the center of our society.

Until you decide to become serious about our families, we can assure you of only one thing. We will survive in spite of you.

Senator DENTON. Thank you, Mr. McKnight.

Dr. Garbarino, would you proceed.

Dr. GARBARINO. Mr. Chairman, I am glad that we are on the same side today, because as you said, a few weeks from now on the football field we will be rooting for the opposite teams.

My professional activity has been directed at helping families and communities deal with some of the moral issues and social problems we face in caring for and nurturing our Nation's children. I am here today to discuss one of those issues that is rapidly becoming a social problem, latchkey children.

By most estimates, some 2 million school age children across the Nation are on their own without direct adult supervision for significant periods of time on a regular basis, usually before or after school.

Two children I know of illustrate this situation and why we are concerned. Mary is an 11-year-old girl. Both her parents work at the plant in her town, so Mary takes care of her little brother and sister from 2:30 in the afternoon until her folks get home. Most days Mary sits and watches television all afternoon. She is not allowed to have other kids over in the afternoons, so there isn't much else to do, and her parents have warned her about strangers in her neighborhood, so she is worried about strangers.

John is 9 years old. His mother works as a dental assistant and she doesn't get home until 7 o'clock in the evening 3 days a week. On those days John is supposed to fix supper for himself and his little brother. Most afternoons he and his brother play on the street with the other kids until everyone has to go in for supper. Then John and his brother watch television until their mom gets home.

Why are these children on their own after school? The most simple explanation is that there is no one around to look after them. For a start, in two-parent homes, the likelihood that both parents are working outside the home has increased markedly in recent decades, to the point where what we call the "traditional family" of two parents with only the father employed outside the home, is actually a minority group.

A majority of mothers are employed outside the home. This is well known. But it goes beyond that. If you are a modern child, chances are it is not just your parents who are not home, but everyone else's as well. There is less likely to be a familiar, friendly neighbor to cover for a child's parents who are not home when the child returns from school.

The world at work is set up to meet the needs of the employers, and employees without child care responsibilities. Most fathers traditionally have been able to concentrate on work without having to worry about covering the homefront. Mothers who for one reason or another have needed or wanted to work outside the home have always had to search, often desperately for ways to cover both the homefront and the workfront. The world of work typically exploits these women. The latchkey child problem is inextricably related to the world at work regarding the needs of parents, particularly single mothers.

The risks associated with being a latchkey child are, I think, of four types: that they will feel badly, that they will act badly, that they will develop badly, and that they will be treated badly.

Some of these children feel rejected. We know this from talking with latchkey children but we don't know how many children feel this way. Likewise, we know that some latchkey children are specially prone to become involved in delinquent behavior. We don't know how many. Nor do we really know if latchkey children do worse in school, although many teachers believe this is a significant and important problem. We do know that unsupervised children are more likely to be the victims of accidents. In a major city, for example, one in six calls received by the fire department involved a child or children alone in the household.

Many poison control centers report similar results. Sexual victimization by siblings and nonparental adults also seems to be a greater risk for the unsupervised child.

The opportunities associated with latchkey children are more limited, and center around the value of independence and responsibility in promoting development. There are those who would argue that, particularly for the older child, the responsibility of being on one's own after school is a positive rather than a negative influence, an opportunity rather than a risk. If we add care of young siblings then the opportunity is still more valuable. However, the primary issue is premature granting of responsibility. We have to be concerned about this, particularly when it occurs because parents feel there are no alternatives, no other choices but to leave the children alone.

We acknowledge that the challenge of independence may lead to growth, but it may also lead to fear and resentment. We know that the social climate of the family has a lot to do with how children and parents cope with the stresses of day to day life. The neighborhood seems to be important in either helping families to make the best of their situation or in driving them into making the worst of it.

Therefore, we should be particularly concerned about latchkey children in unsupportive neighborhoods where the risk of exploitation, delinquent behavior, alienation, and accidents is particularly high. A survey conducted by the Foundation for Child Development found that a third of the children in New York City said they were afraid to go outside.

Finally, we must consider the effects of an unsupervised child on the parent. Where the parent is uncomfortable with the necessity of leaving the child alone, the after-school hours can be fraught with worry. This stress may be destructive in its own right. Parents may attempt to exert control over unsupervised children by forbidding them to go out, by spying on them through siblings or peers, or by telephoning the home repeatedly to check compliance with rules.

This may lead to further family conflict. Children may punish absent parents by repeatedly calling them at work or by engaging in provocative behavior. In any case, it is rarely easy for the caring parent who feels trapped into leaving children unsupervised, particularly in a nonsupportive neighborhood.

What is the bottom line? The evidence available to us suggests that many of our latchkey children are too young to go home alone. They need adult supervision for their protection and for the protection of our communities. Anything we can do to make work and parental responsibilities fit together better and to insure the high quality after-school care exists is a step in the right direction.

I think we face a significant problem but one of manageable proportions. Some communities operating out of neighborhood schools, neighborhood church groups, and youth groups are acting in good faith to fill this growing gap in the life of America's children. I think the Federal Government can help by stimulating facilitating these efforts and by standing out of the way as they get going.

Thank you.

[The information supplied by Dr. Garbarino follows:]

Testimony of James Garbarino
Senate Sub-committee on Aging, Family and Human Services
September 17, 1981

"Latchkey Children"

Mr. Chairman:

My name is James Garbarino, Associate Professor of Human Development, The Pennsylvania State University (S-110 Henderson Human Development Building, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania 16802-6591, 814/863-0267).

I am here to discuss latchkey children--children who are without adult supervision for significant periods of time on a regular basis, usually before or after school. Based upon my review of the evidence, I believe these children--numbering in the millions across our nation--are vulnerable to special challenges and threats. The attached document (an issue of Vital Issues I wrote entitled "Latchkey Children: Getting the Short End of the Stick") contains my views on this situation and current efforts to meet it.

Vital Issues
(REG. U.S. PAT. OFF.)
A service of the
CENTER FOR INFORMATION ON AMERICA
WASHINGTON, CONNECTICUT 06793
Volume XXX, Number 3

Cover by Lauren LoCascio.

LATCHKEY CHILDREN

Getting the Short End of the Stick?

by James Garbarino

(Dr. Garbarino is Associate Professor of Human Development, Division of Individual and Family Studies, The Pennsylvania State University. In preparation of this article, the author expresses his appreciation to Steve Danish, Nancy Galambos, and Elliot Asp for their comments.)

- Mary is ten years old. Both her parents work at the plant until 5:00, so Mary takes care of her little brother and sister from 2:30, when school lets out, until nearly 6:00, when her folks get home. Most days Mary just sits and watches television all afternoon. She isn't allowed to have other kids over in the afternoons, so there isn't much else to do.
- John is nine years old. His mother works as a dental assistant and she doesn't get home until 7:00 three days a week. On those days John is supposed to fix supper for himself and his little brother. Most afternoons he and his brother play on the street with the other kids until everyone has to go in for supper. Then John and his brother watch television until their mom comes home.
- Sadie is eleven years old. After school she is on her own until 6:30, when she walks out to meet her mother's bus. Her mother works for the city hospital as a nurse. Sadie usually plays with her best friend Debbie after school until it's time to go meet her mother.
- Jimmy is 12 years old. Both his parents work all day. His stepfather drives a truck cross-country and his mother is a waitress. When his stepfather is on the road (about half the time), Jimmy is on his own until 9:00 P.M. when his mother gets off work.

Mary, John, Sadie and Jimmy are all "latchkey children." They come home from school to an empty house — and have their own key to get in. It is usually on a string around their necks to keep them from losing it. Their situations are similar, and they are part of a group of children now thought to number almost two million.

How do children feel when they come home from school to an empty house? Do they feel lonely, deserted, resentful and angry? Or, do they feel proud, trusted, responsible, independent and grown up? Or, doesn't it matter very much one way or the other. And how do these unsupervised children act when they come home from school to an empty house? What do they do? Do they have fun? Do they get into trouble? With ever growing numbers of children joining the ranks of America's "latchkey children" we need to know.

EDITORIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE: Henry S. Commager, Professor of History, Amherst College; Richard W. Cartright, Division of Instruction and Professional Development, National Education Association; Sister Sarah Fasenmyer, Dean, School of Education, Catholic University of America; James W. Fesler, Professor of Government, Yale University; Eric F. Goldman, Professor of History, Princeton University; Philip Handler, President of the National Academy of Sciences; Richard I. Miller, Associate Director of Programs, Illinois Board of Higher Education; Robert Spiller, Professor Emeritus of English, University of Pennsylvania, and Past-President of the American Studies Association.

EDITOR: Townsend Scudder, President of the Center

First Printing November, 1980. Copyright ©1980 by The Center for Information on America. A non-profit and non-partisan educational corporation.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

While some people believe that being a latchkey child is a positive experience, many others are convinced that these latchkey children are getting the short end of the stick. For many of us, the idea of children being on their own after school is disturbing. In fact, some would go beyond this feeling to assert that these children are a problem — to themselves, to their peers, and to their communities. As citizens and parents we need to know if this phenomenon really is a "problem," and if it is, how to deal with it.

Why are children on their own after school? The most simple explanation is based on the fact that there is no one around to look after them. For a start, in two-parent homes, the likelihood that both parents are working outside the home has increased markedly in recent decades, to the point where the "traditional" family (two parents, father employed) is actually a minority. A majority of mothers are employed outside the home. This is well-known to anyone who reads the newspapers, and it has the obvious effect of "depriving" children of a parent at home after school. But it goes beyond this, of course. If you are a modern child, chances are it is not just *your* parents who are not home, but everyone else's as well (to exaggerate only slightly). There is less likely to be a familiar, friendly neighbor to cover for a child's parents who are not home when the child returns from school. This last is a very important point, and merits amplification.

The last fifty years have seen a general emptying of the social environment of children (See "For Further Reading," *Garbarino*, 1978). A patchwork of evidence tells this story. At the turn of the century in Massachusetts, for example, roughly half the households had at least one nonparental adult in them — typically a relative or a lodger. Now the "extra" adult is a rarity (c.f., *Bronfenbrenner*, 1975). The twentieth century has seen a trend towards age-segregated housing (young families in one area, the elderly in another). This has still further decreased the availability of "extra" adults by altering the demographic composition of neighborhoods. Also, the recent trend towards smaller families means fewer teenagers are available to help care for and supervise children — their siblings as well as neighbors. Finally, the salience of small towns and urban neighborhoods has decreased. That decrease has meant more privacy, and thus less intrusiveness on the part of nonparental adults into the lives of children, but it has also meant fewer adults taking *responsibility* for other people's children. Modern urban environments offer much more privacy — which also means a greater likelihood of social isolation. These social trends offer parents fewer social resources at the very time when the increase in two worker families means they need help more than ever. Thus much of the "problem" is attributable to broad social trends in America affecting family life (c.f., *Garbarino*, 1978).

All these trends seem to make worse the almost inevitable connection between latchkey children and single parenthood. Just as the emergence of the two wage-earner family is well known, so the rise of the single parent household is now common knowledge. The United States Census bureau estimates that roughly half the American children born in 1980 will spend some of their first 18 years in a single parent household. The economics of the situation typically dictate that the single parent be in the labor force as well, and since 90% of single parents are women, and women earn on the average roughly half what men do, many if not most of these single parents have trouble affording to pay for after school care (assuming such care is available). They have trouble paying for the care of preschool children where some adult supervision seems essential to nearly all parents, so afterschool care for schoolage children may seem an unaffordable luxury. This is compounded by the fact that single parents are only half as likely to join another household than they once were (*Bronfenbrenner*, 1975). This, combined with the other forces depleting the social environment of the child, produces more children who have no one waiting for them after school.

How many latchkey children are there? No one really knows for sure. But there are data that shed some light on the magnitude of the problem. We know there are something like 40 million children under the age of 14 in America, and 8 million of them receive care from some nonparental adult during the day (other than teachers during school hours). A report by the Bureau of the Census (1976) reported that roughly 13% of the children ages 7-13 whose mothers work outside the home cared for themselves (and .4% of the 3-6 year olds did so). Children caring for themselves were twice as likely to be in single parent than in two parent families. The magnitude of the problem is thus substantial — probably close to two million children are involved. To these children we must add the thousands of children who are not even attending school, and who slip through the cracks in our record keeping systems. According to a study by the Childrens Defense Fund (1974), more than 7 percent of America's schoolage children are not attending school — and we can presume that many of them are unsupervised. Precise numbers depend in part, of course, on the cutoff age used. If we set the age at which children no longer need adult supervision higher rather than lower we include more latchkey children in the category. The Census Bureau's choice of 13 as the cutoff age seems appropriate.

But does it matter? Is the latchkey child a problem? Is self-care an *opportunity* for the child to become more mature, or does it place the child at *risk* (or both; an opportunity for some and a risk for others)? We owe it to these children to think this matter through carefully, and not assume our initial emotional reaction (be it pro *or* con) tells the whole story.

The risks associated with latchkey children are of four types: that they will feel badly (e.g., rejected and alienated); that they will act badly (e.g., delinquency and vandalism); that they will develop badly (e.g., academic failure); and that they will be treated badly (e.g., accidents and sexual victimization). All four are quite real.

We know that rejection is a strongly negative force in child development. One researcher refers to it as a "psychological malignancy" (*Rohner*, 1975). Some of these children do feel rejected. We know this from talking with latchkey children, but we don't know how many feel this way. Likewise, we know that some latchkey children are specially prone to become involved in delinquent behavior. How many? We don't know. Nor do we really know if latchkey children do worse in school, although many teachers believe this is a significant and important problem. We do know that unsupervised children are more likely to be the victims of accidents (a leading cause of death among children). In a major city, for example, one in six calls received by the fire department involved a child (or children) alone in the household. Many poison control centers present a similar picture. Sexual victimization by siblings and nonparental adults also seems to be a greater risk for the unsupervised child. David Finkelhor's (1979) excellent study of sexual victimization includes many examples of unsupervised children falling victim in this manner.

The opportunities associated with latchkey children are more limited, and center around the value of independence and responsibility in promoting development. There are those who would argue that, particularly for the older child, the responsibility of being on one's own after school is a positive rather than a negative influence, an opportunity rather than a risk. If care of young siblings is added then the opportunity is still greater. Indeed, Judge Dembitz took precisely this view in a case where a mother was cited for neglect for leaving her three children (ages 13, 10, and 8) unattended after school for two hours:

> ". . . possible self-responsibility to this limited extent, in a family where parents show an over-all affection and concern, may not only be harmless but beneficial." (cited in *Goldstein, Freud* and *Solnit*, 1979, p. 67).

We *must* remember that challenge is often growth inducing. Certainly Glen Elder's (1974) follow-up of youth whose families were hit by the Great Depression of the 1930's showed that, for some at least, the negative outcomes were balanced by beneficial consequences — particularly when their family was strong and they were teenagers when the challenge arose. This is an important point. It is the *premature* granting of responsibility, particularly when it occurs in a negative emotional climate, that seems to be damaging. No social event affects all children or youth equally and in the same way. Nearly all experiences are mediated by the quality and character of the family. Thus, we know that some kids will thrive on the opportunity of being a latchkey child; others will just manage to cope. Still others will be at risk, and still others will be harmed. It is often difficult to separate the specific effects of the latchkey situation from the more general condition of the family (and the neighborhood in which that family lives). Still more difficult is the task of determining what the child's life would be like if a parent was at home (and thus didn't work outside of the home) or worked at other times (during a night shift while the husband is at home).

We all know that economic deprivation can make things rough for families. Indeed, many experts report that stress associated with the world of work is *the* primary threat to American families (c.f., *Kenniston*, 1977; National Academy of Sciences, 1976). But we also know that the social climate of a family has a lot to do with how they cope with the stresses of life. The neighborhood seems to be important in either helping families to make the best of their situation or in driving them into making the worst of it. This conclusion arises from research on how "high-risk" families adapt to supportive versus stressful neighborhood environments (*Garbarino & Gilliam*, 1980). Significantly, latchkey children were more common in a socially impoverished neighborhood than they were in a socially enriched neighborhood, even though both areas contained the same proportion of working mothers, single parents and low income families. We should be particularly concerned about latchkey children in such unsupportive environments, where the risk of exploitation, delinquent behavior, alienation, and accidents is particularly high. A survey conducted by the Foundation for Child Development found that a third of the children in New York City said they were afraid to go outside (*Lash & Sigal*, 1976).

Finally, we must consider the effects of an unsupervised child on the parent. Where the parent is uncomfortable with the necessity of leaving the child alone, the after school hours can be fraught with worry. This stress may be destructive in its own right. Parents may attempt to exert control over unsupervised children by forbidding them to go out, by "spying on them" through siblings or peers, or by telephoning the home to check compliance. This, of course, may lead to conflict and exacerbate the built-in tensions of the latchkey situation. Children may "punish" absent parents by repeatedly calling them at work or by engaging in provocative behavior. In any case, it is rarely easy for the caring parent who feels trapped into leaving children unsupervised.

What is the bottom line? How do the risks and opportunities stack up? Clearly most children are not seriously harmed and no doubt many do well. However, it seems the risks outweigh the opportunities, as there should be suitable alternate ways to provide the potentially positive aspects of responsibility for self-care without inflicting the risks of being unsupervised. Surely we can give children sufficient opportunities for independence and responsibility without exposing them to the potential dangers of unsupervised after-school hours. Looked at this way, the latchkey situation *is* a social problem.

What can we do to help? There are two strategies worth pursuing. The first seeks to better reconcile the roles of worker and parent. The second seeks to provide alternatives to a parent at home, on the one hand, and a child alone, on the other. Both are worthy of our attention.

As many commentators and researchers have noted publicly (and most of us have known privately), the world of work is set up to meet the needs of employers and employees without childcare responsibilities. Most fathers have traditionally been able to concentrate on work without having to worry about covering the homefront. Mothers who for one reason or another have needed or wanted to work outside the home have always had to search (often desperately) for ways to cover both the homefront and the workfront. The world of work has typically scorned or exploited these women (or both). The latchkey child problem is inextricably related to the relative inflexibility of the world of work regarding the needs of parents.

Thus, one way to attack the latchkey children problem is to encourage more flexible work arrangements for parents. Industrial leaders in this area have adopted flex time arrangements that permit workers to adapt their hours to their scheduling needs as parents. Also, they have improved the status and benefits of part-time workers to make it easier to meet parental responsibilities without foregoing occupational success. There are limits to this as a solution, however, and we need to proceed on the assumption that many parents will not be able to be home when their children leave school.

What are the alternatives to the parent being home, on the one hand, and the child being alone, on the other? They seem to be of two classes. First, children might remain at school, after regular hours, for some sort of day care program. Such programs exist. The School-Age Child Care Project run by James Levine and Michelle Seltzer at the Wellesley College Center for Research on Women (Wellesley, Massachusetts 02181; phone 617-235-0320) is a shining beacon in this field. The Project is based on field-tested models for school-age child care. Levine's 1976 book, *Day Care and the Public Schools*, sets the stage for the present national program by examining the workings of "partnership models" linking school and community. The Project is focusing on two documents of use to parents and educators seeking to deal with the latchkey phenomenon. A *"School-Age Child Care Action Manual"* provides a "hands-on" guidebook on how to set up services for latchkey children. The companion volume (*Action Manual and Policy Report)* focuses on the various forms that school-community partnerships may productively take. The School-Age Child Care Project received national attention in a 1980 article in *Redbook* magazine written by Levine and Seltzer. Previous mention of the Project in publications such as *Ladies Home Journal* and *McCall's* stimulated more than 1500 inquiries, showing the timeliness of such a program. The need is great; the feeling on the part of parents runs strong and deep.

The Massachusetts Project is not alone, of course. Programs exist in many other areas. Nashville, Tennessee, has the Davidson County School-Age Day Care Task Force (P.O. Box 120674, Nashville, Tennessee 37212). S. Holly Stocking, writing in *The Single Parent Magazine*, described the efforts of parents and educators working within the Minneapolis, Minnesota "community education" concept (Latch Key, 6425 West 33rd Street, St. Louis Park, Minnesota 55426). Clearly a movement is underway to utilize schools as sites and focal points for care. They aren't the answer for everyone, all the time, of course, but they are a very good way to help many families.

Parents need three things that some formal afterschool care programs can't or won't provide, however: part-time regular care; care for sick children; and, inexpensive care. Whatever else childcare may be, it must be affordable. It is partly for this reason that most childcare is based in someone's home rather than in a formal institutional setting, and that some children will probably always be on their own. But even here, however, the community can help. Schools can improve the survival and "homemaking" skills of latchkey children. Cranston, Rhode Island's schools began a program called HELP (Homemaking Elementary Learning Procedures) to help children care for themselves (*Newsweek*, 1980). Certainly such approaches are an important supplement to actual child care programs. Even this is not the whole story, however.

The U. S. Census Bureau report cited earlier indicates that when 7-13 year olds are cared for by someone other than the parent or the children themselves they are almost 18 times more likely to be in someone's home than in an institutional setting. Preschool-age day care (much better established institutionally) shows a similar pattern, with home-based care nine times more common than center-based care.

Many parents need to make arrangements on the spur of the moment because of unanticipated or irregularly scheduled responsibilities. They need flexibility — perhaps a "drop in" arrangement. A related but different problem is the sick child. Most care programs (and schools for that matter) cannot accept sick children (for the obvious reasons of contagion and liability). Many parents have little choice but to take off from work or to leave the child alone.

What are the alternatives? One is for a formal program of visiting caregivers. Such programs exist in other countries, and even in some parts of our own. Most people depend, however, upon informal arrangements with friends, neighbors and relatives. Can the official human service agencies do anything to nurture these informal arrangements? They can do at least three things. First, they can encourage professionals to work as consultants to these helping networks (*Garbarino & Stocking*, 1980). As consultants, professionals can improve the quality of informal care arrangements (*Collins & Watson*, 1976). Second, they can help stimulate these networks and disseminate information about their "services" to families in need of assistance. Given the uneven quality of all forms of day care, most parents can use some help in locating good quality care, as the experience of day care referral services around the country shows (c.f., *Collins & Pancoast*, 1976). Third, they can support research to determine whether children benefit from or are harmed by being unsupervised. In this connection, they can help community groups document the extent of the problem in their own area. Such a report of basic statistics can go a long way toward stimulating public concern.

Is being a latchkey child an opportunity or a risk? Stocking's article was entitled "Too Young to Go Home Alone." The fragmentary evidence available to us suggests that many of our latchkey children *are* too young to go home alone. They need adult supervision, for their protection and for the protection of the community. Anything we can do to make work and parental responsibilities fit together better, and to ensure that high quality formal and informal after-school care exists, is a step in the right direction. We don't need a national gnashing of teeth and wailing of woe. We don't face a "crisis" here, but rather a significant problem of manageable proportions. Communities are acting in good faith and with reasonable dispatch to fill this growing gap in the life of America's children.

Additional Questions for Dr. Garbarino:

1. Do you have nay suggestions as to how more industries in the private sector might be encouraged to adopt flextime hours so that working parents can adjust?

2. Much of the focus of the hearing was on pirmary intervention and prevention. Is there any way to identify a personality characteristic in a child that might indicate that the child would be particularly vulnerable in a "latchkey" situation?

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT
UNIVERSITY PARK, PENNSYLVANIA 16802

Division of Individual and Family Studies
S-110 Henderson Human Development Building

Area Code 814
863-0267

[illegible] OCT [illegible] 10 12

October 26, 1981

Senator Jeremiah Denton
United States Senate
Committee on Labor and Human Resources
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Denton:

In response to your September 28 letter requesting information as a follow-up to testimony at the hearing on Primary Intervention in Societal Problems: The Role of the Family:

1. flextime: enclosed is a statement from a faculty colleague who specializes in issues of work and family;

2. personality characteristics of children: we don't have research specifically indicating personality characteristics that make children vulnerable to a latchkey situation. However, based on what we do know, it seems clear that children with low self-esteem, who are very susceptible to peer pressure, with a record of academic difficulties, and who are generally immature for their age, would be at special risk. All of these characteristics would be modified by the rest of the environment in which the latchkey experience takes place, of course.

Sincerely,

James Garbarino

James Garbarino, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of
Human Development

JG/as

Enclosure

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY UNIVERSITY

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT
UNIVERSITY PARK, PENNSYLVANIA 16802

Division of Individual and Family Studies
S-110 Henderson Human Development Building

Area Code 814
863-0267

October 26, 1981

Senator Jeremiah Denton
United States Senate
Committee on Labor and Human Resources
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Denton:

My colleague, Professor Jim Garbarino, passed on your request for information about flextime scheduling to me in the hope that I could provide you with some information. In your letter of September 28 you asked how more industries in the private sector might be encouraged to adopt flextime hours so that working parents can adjust.

Recent research indicates that flextime enhances both morale and productivity at the workplace (see Nollen's "Does Flextime Improve Productivity?" Harvard Business Review 1979, September/October p. 4-8). The empirical evidence is less clear on the issue of direct benefits of flextime for families. Halcyone Bohen's recent research on flextime (Balancing Jobs and Family Life, Temple University Press, 1981) revealed that the families most helped by a modest flextime system were those without children. The explanation is that families with children are under so much pressure that a modest form of flexible scheduling does not make enough difference. Thus, the message appears to be that flextime, while a contributor to the quality of work life, needs to be accompanied by other benefits to be supportive of family life.

There are a variety of ways in which industry could be encouraged to adopt flextime scheduling. The primary method will have to be research and dissemination about the benefits of flextime. Conferences in which people from labor, management, and community organizations participate (e.g., The White House Conference on the Family) are one vehicle for such dissemination. In the long run, we also need more research on the impact of family functioning on the workplace. Such research may provide powerful evidence that it is in the best interests of employers to provide family-oriented support to employees, including flextime.

I am encouraged that you have identified the connections between work life and family life as important because I am convinced that our society will benefit most from social policy that enhances the quality of life in both settings. Please let me know if I can be of help in the future.

Sincerely,

Ann C. Crouter

Ann C. Crouter, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of
Human Development

ACC/as

Senator DENTON. Thank you, Dr. Garbarino. As I ask questions of individuals please feel free, the other two, to address any remarks you care to make to those questions.

I'll begin with questions for Mr. Woodson.

Much of the past research you have done on mediating structures has focused on four such units, on the neighborhood, the church, the family and voluntary associations.

Could you give us an example of other mediating structures as you define that term and explain why you chose to study the four structures which you did?

Mr. WOODSON. There are voluntary ethnic subgroups, there are church-related organizations within that group, and as we said the individual family we consider to be a mediating institution.

This is not meant to be all-inclusive. Dr. Peter Berger and Richard Newhouse, the original authors of the study, selected these institutions and our work was built based upon their earlier work, but it was never intended as I said to be in any way exclusive. These are just some clear examples.

Based on my own personal experience and professional experience, I went out and looked at examples of how they functioned. That was the reason we selected those.

Senator DENTON. I may not have caught the full context of one of your remarks about adoption. I hope you have not gleaned from whatever press reports you may have read, which do not always reflect the real verbatim nor even the philosophical message that may have been involved in the hearings themselves, any misinterpretation of what I have said. I have never proposed that adoption of, say, illegitimate children would be a total solution to any problem; or that there has been a failure on the part of any group to adopt children.

I have admired efforts made to adopt children as a means of providing a universal family as Mr. McKnight would define it, one that has adoptive parents.

These particular adoptive parents love the child, and have had great success in raising the child. The example which struck me so was a black clergyman out in Chicago with whom you may be familiar, who initiated a program called one church, one child which noted the number of stray black children—he had a predominantly black church—in the streets.

Mr. WOODSON. Yes.

Senator DENTON. And he, being conscious of the many clamorings for this or that right, or this or that indication of impartation of dignity, simply said let us show that we as blacks, separate from the Government will give special attention to the relatively high incidence of illegitimacy.

This is true in my own State of Alabama. I say that with a parenthetical expression that I have seen more greatness of character among black people, because I believe that one of the differences between blacks and whites historically is that blacks over the past couple of hundred years have come through a much more rigorous experience.

Mr. WOODSON. That's right.

Senator DENTON. Despite the fact that these rigors have caused economic disadvantages and social disadvantages among blacks, they have also brought out nobilities in terms of thought patterns and so forth.

Mr. WOODSON. Yes.

Senator DENTON. So I have been inspired by black men and women and children right around my home in Mobile, Ala., to a greater degree than I have by the less rigorously backgrounded people of my own color. But I do say that there is a large illegitimacy problem and there are a lot of those children out there.

So this gentleman's one church, one child, idea started with this program and remarkably enough, Mr. Woodson, in a meeting with 150 of his congregation attending, he gave a talk, and as a result of that talk 17 children were adopted.

Mr. WOODSON. Yes.

Senator DENTON. Now, I can't see that as a bad effort I just wanted to mention that to you. I would have to take exception with you in good will if you think that there is something wrong with this effort.

Mr. WOODSON. Absolutely not. I don't see anything incompatible with what you are saying. In fact I totally agree. In fact, Dr. Robert Hill, through his studies, reveals there are about 3 million children living away from their own homes, in what he called informal adoption, and half of them are black children living with friends, relatives, and other informal arrangements. Only a small proportion of these children is under State control.

The problem is there are a lot of Father Clements and many of his congregates around the country who truly desire to care for these children in need. No matter how many Father Clements may recruit, once those people have to go to the social agencies—be they public or private—there is going to be a rude awakening. You will get a situation of people of good will coming into the agency, many of them turned off by the first interview, many of them will be put through the rigorous 2-year study where they will be asked to come in and spend money, $1,500 for a study up front. Not many people I know can afford that. They will be asked all kinds of ridiculous questions; be asked to write an autobiography and be put through the ringer to the point where many of them will just drop out. The assumption is that this process is necessary to be an adoptive parent, so that, therefore, there must be something deficient about these prospective adoptive parents that they are unable to go through it or withstand it.

But we have all kinds of positive examples of when the rules have been changed, and that can be what Father Clements would do. So I don't see any disagreements.

Senator DENTON. I just wanted to understand, too, because I guess your point is that there are too many——

Mr. WOODSON [continuing]. Barriers.

Senator DENTON [continuing]. Unnecessary requirements and too much time wasted in ascertaining qualifications for an adoptive parent.

Mr. WOODSON. Yes, qualification standards that are unrelated to parenting, whether or not a parent or parents can offer a healthy home.

Senator DENTON. I guess what I was addressing was what is the major reason why we have that problem?

Mr. WOODSON. That backlog.

Senator DENTON. Wouldn't we also very usefully address it from the point of view of showing compassion for a special need and try to get more adoptive parents?

In other words, have these adoptive parents, which Father Clements identified, been unsuccessful in going through the process, or what?

Mr. WOODSON. I don't know about Father Clements, but in most cases like Homes for Black Children, Black Child Development Institute, the black social workers all have engaged in tremendous recruiting efforts throughout the country and they have recruited thousands of people. In the New York experience, the auditors there found that thousands of people were recruited, requested children, and over 95 percent of them either withdrew from the application process or were turned down so that——

Senator DENTON. So there are more than enough prospective adoptive parents?

Mr. WOODSON. More than enough.

Senator DENTON. Or more than enough volunteers to take care of the adoption situation?

Mr. WOODSON. Yes.

And the principal reasons you don't have adoptions is because of the barriers that are imposed by organizations and agencies that have a perverse incentive for maintaining these children in care. Again, the framework is determined by the Federal Government's system of payment. So I think that much more attention needs to be given this area. As a consequence of the policy framework in health and human services, under title XX, the Federal Government is contributing to these children being cared for away from their homes, and providing no incentives for their moving into stable homes. I have written many editorials in the New York Times and the Washington Post and other papers around the country, and following the publication of those articles I am deluged with calls from prospective parents of all races and income levels calling and commending me for saying these things. They wonder why this system continues as it has.

I hope the Senate will pay much more attention to the details of what is happening at the Federal level.

Senator DENTON. I understand what you are saying and I am learning from what you are saying and I agree with what you are saying. You would not consider us to have erred then in drawing attention to the fact that adoption into a family unit is an alternative into which the Government has not looked, but has much more concentrated on some kind of institutional care for that child?

Mr. WOODSON. Yes.

Senator DENTON. That child, you know, needs to be loved, needs to be wanted. So I am with you. What specific suggestions can you give? These would be very important particularly with contributions from your fellow witnesses there. What suggestions can you give that the Government could take to make adoption more effective as an alternative, and a more accessible alternative?

Mr. WOODSON. I have detailed lists, Senator, on the basis of studies we have made. I would be glad to submit these specific recommendations to you today. I'll make sure a messenger brings them over to you, because I think it is very important. You are one of the few Senators asking these kinds of questions.

The first thing that can be done is the Federal Government, the Senate, ought to demand that Health and Human Services first of all determine how many children they are paying for. At present, someone can go into Sears and buy a hammer and at the end of the month we will know where the hammer was purchased, how much was paid for it and everything else. Today neither the Federal Government, nor one State, can tell you how many children it has under care.

The Federal Government does not know how many children it is paying for. Estimates are from 500,000 to 700,000. But I think the Senate ought to direct HHS to undertake a count. In addition, they should not rely upon researchers that are related to the industry. That has been the real problem.

They have gone to the Child Welfare League of America. That's a noble organization, but they are industry-related, and as long as people who benefit from this condition are allowed to be the technicians who address this issue, it will never change.

So I would be glad to—without taking too much of your time now—I will be glad to submit other recommendations that came out of our research, those of us who are not industry bound.

Senator DENTON. We solicit those recommendations, and you need not give them verbally, they will be included in the record and will be very carefully considered as findings.

Having been away from this country for a number of years, I came back and noticed changes which sort of confirmed thoughts I had while I was gone about what the essence of our greatness was. And the shock of what forgetfulness we have had about it has compelled me to get involved in some of these things.

I hope that people looking at this hearings record see it as more than a hearing on the specific subject which we are addressing because there is a source, it's the core of a huge problem and we are not seeing the forest for the trees. We are addressing trees.

Mr. WOODSON. That's right.

Senator DENTON. Instead of the forests. One of you talked about the latchkey children who may develop badly and you mentioned some of the ways in which they may develop. It is my own persuasion that the family—whatever that universal family is that you are talking about—is the irreplacable social unit in which not only does the child learn to behave, not only does he feel loved, but he develops the concept of compassion, of justice, of reward and punishment.

Mr. WOODSON. That's right.

Senator DENTON. That is primary intervention. God knows I wish we didn't have to intervene but if we have to intervene, let's do it at the input end of the pipe, not at the output where we put all this rehabilitation money and not necessarily compassionately, because we are not putting enough up here at this end.

Mr. WOODSON. That's right.

Senator DENTON. We have failed to recognize the educational and formative functions of the family. Would the three of you generally agree with that premise?

Mr. **Woodson**. Yes; I agree.

Mr. **McKnight**. Yes, that's right.

Senator **Denton**. I have taken off on a target but go ahead.

Dr. **Garbarino**. I think one of the evolutionary changes that a lot of us are seeing is this growing estrangement, this gap between families and the people who are offering professional services that augment the traditional services of the church, neighborhoods, and so on. A couple of years ago when I was in Europe, I spoke with a woman who had been trained as a nurse and as a social worker. Her job was very different in many ways from many American professionals in that field. Rather than working out of a central office—and in this way we in America are kind of old-fashioned—she had a neighborhood that was her beat, much like the old cop on the beat. I was trying to figure out if the people in her area thought of her as a nurse or social worker and I tried, unsuccessfully to ask about this. I finally asked her, "When you are going to visit someone, who do they say is coming?"—thinking she would say the nurse or the social worker is coming. But she said, "They say, Kathleen is coming," because they knew her in that area as a person, as a regular part of that community. So, to bring us back to your point, people didn't wait until things had reached the crisis point before approaching her, she was the resource that people could draw upon early on because they knew her. They knew she had a commitment to that area; she wasn't coming in and out, she belonged there. So people might approach her with something that was out of their depth.

Some say, I have been trying to help my neighborhood on that problem but now it's beyond me, can you offer any suggestions.

I think one direction we can profitably use the large social service professional industry for is to move them back into closer touch with the neighborhoods that they serve, make them more neighborhood-based, move them out of the centralized offices where they necessarily become impersonal and bureaucratic. I think anyone knows that. If you have to deal with 10,000 people, they have to become numbers and impersonal faces.

But when you are responsible for a small area, you get to know the nuances, you get to know who you can trust as a source of information, how to work through people, who you can talk to in order to care for somebody else.

I think that is one of the directions that would let us get better and more effective use out of the professional services than we do.

I think it is indisputable that they are necessary at this point in our development. It is a question of making better use of them.

Senator **Denton**. Mr. McKnight?

Mr. **McKnight**. One of the primary intervention questions—and I would go back to one of the points Mr. Woodson made—when we think about adoption, what we have now is an incentive—there is the original family, the potential adopting family, and in between there is an industry, the child welfare industry.

With public policy that gives largely incentives for that industry to——

Senator **Denton**. Excuse me, largely what?

Mr. **McKnight** [continuing]. Gives largely incentives to keep children in between. In other words, what that industry is doing is it fills that space between the original family and a potentially adoptive family and we have built policy incentives to keep people in the middle, in a sense.

What we want to do is keep them on either end if we can. We just talk about adoption as one of the ways of doing that. The other one, the other area for, I think, congressional consideration is for Congress to review how you keep kids from getting out of their family in the first place because there are a lot of kids in the middle who shouldn't be there. They should be back with their family and Bob Woodson hits, I think, at the critical policy issue there and let me give you a brief example, an experience that we encountered in a study we are doing of children who have been deinstitutionalized to see what effect that had upon them.

We had a panel of three kids, we were talking with them. One of them was a 9-year-old girl. In the course of the discussion, one of our staff said something indicating to that girl that her foster parents were people who received money for her care. You should have been there to see it. She stopped the meeting and she said, "What?" And she broke down in tears. She finally composed herself enough so we could understand what the problem was.

She said, "If my family had had that much money, they would never had had to have me leave."

So that conceptually, from a policy standpoint, you want to get at this question, it seems to me. And it is that there is an industry in the middle, keeping kids in the middle, erecting barriers at one end and at the other end, with two policy directions. But if we are serious about kids and families and adoption, or not taking kids out of their families in the first place, that has to be addressed.

Senator DENTON. I promise you we will look into that. And, of course, the governmental or bureaucratic tendency, you know, is to get more power, more time consumption, more money into that intervening bureaucracy, and I can see how that may have grown.

I can also see another point. One could have misunderstood your remarks earlier. There is an unnecessary dichotemy between the so-called profamily groups and those who emphasize the utility of finding some other familial arrangement if the nuclear family is broken. I can see how they might have misunderstood you earlier but when you then emphasized that we need more help for the original family, the nuclear family, than we are giving it now, they would wholeheartedly agree, of course.

This is not principally a governmental harm done, in my opinion, to the nuclear family. It is a national denegration of the previous place in the heirarchy of values in which we held the mother-father, wife-husband/child relationship.

I saw an article in the Wall Street Journal, where the writer was making funny, mocking comments as to sexual mores and economic disaster, as she called it, in the United States, and she went on to pose the premise that we were all fouled up in the first place to look at the happy family as being anything really important. She called it the great unhappy American family, from which we have now in our "enlightened" State departed from evaluating as highly as we previously did.

I think that philosophy is greatly detrimental to the health of the institution of the family and it's something that is in the media, it's in academe, and it's something to me that is sick, and will contribute to our problems.

Go ahead Mr. Woodson.

Mr. Woodson. A couple of points that footnote this whole discussion: the reason I emphasize child care and foster care so strongly is that these areas really represent incubators for much of the youth crime. Also for children in foster care, the mortality rate is twice that of the national average.

Out-of-home care is being done in the name of helping children. But it creates for foster children twice the national average mortality rate of other children.

Also, 50 percent of the children in our juvenile justice system come out of the child welfare, child care system because they are emotionally disturbed, and this is the consequence of State intervention. I have to slightly disagree with my fellow panelists who say professionals have to have a role. I think professionalism ought to be like salt. It ought to be given when asked. A little bit can flavor the food and make it taste good, but too much of it can kill you.

It seems to me that the primary means of intervention ought to be in the neighborhoods themselves. Sometimes a sympathetic hair dresser is best. Everybody seems to come to her kitchen for coffee, and she can be just as effective as any therapist or anyone trained in the professions. This brings me to another issue. The whole matter of regulatory barriers to self-help. We have professional guilds working in conjunction or collusion with State regulatory bodies to limit people from helping themselves by imposing a lot of barriers to their self-help, such as the need for professional degrees and what have you.

So there are all kinds of regulatory barriers that AEI is involved in assessing. We ought, I think, to look at professionals as supplemental to natural helping networks and they ought to be joined in partnerships with these people, and not be determining care or determining who is healthy, who is sick, and what constitutes treatment, or when that treatment should occur. There should be much more accountability to those who are the consumers of the service, rather than those who are the providers of the service.

Senator Denton. You would be disposed to help develop a realistic set of parameters upon which to judge the suitability of adoptive parents?

Mr. Woodson. Yes.

Senator Denton. And they would have to be, you know, substantial. You know more than I whether or not there would in some cases be some evil motive, perhaps.

Mr. Woodson. Sure.

Senator Denton. Perhaps you could comment on this—would someone want to adopt a 15-year-old and put the kid to work mowing the lawn or some such similar thing?

Mr. Woodson. Yes, reasonable standards are necessary, but they should not be determined by, established by people that have an interest in maintaining that child away from his home. That is the point.

Senator Denton. And who have a vested interest in the system.

Mr. Woodson. Vested interest, yes.

Senator DENTON. That takes more attention.

Dr. GARBARINO. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I think we have to be careful that we don't set up a straw man, an easy target here. Around the country a lot of the forces that generate the kind of professional boondoggle that we are talking about, a lot of the forces that started that trend did not come from the professionals themselves. They came from the community leaders who may look at that one parent you are talking about who might abuse the privilege of being a foster parent or adoptive parent and turn it back and say to the professional, "Why weren't you more strict in regulating who got children?"

Or it comes perhaps from community or religious leaders who cast stones, who criticize and become outraged that a family doesn't conform to their expectations. Then they, in turn, put pressure on the local government to put pressure on the local social services.

So I think you have to recognize that the social service professionals in many communities is caught. They may want to make it easier for people to adopt children, and they may want to make it easier for kids to stay in their homes, but in the back of their minds there is always the possibility if they leave one child at home and something happens to that child, the weight of community opinion is going to come crashing down on them from the local pulpits, from the local newspaper, and from the local government.

I think if we are going to ask professionals to be more forthcoming in giving this power back to parents, back to local neighborhood leaders, we have to be more tolerant of what some of the results may be, and there may be negative results that we may not like.

You know it is very easy to glorify, romanticize the good old days when professional services didn't exist or were very small scale. But I think there are lots of horror stories about the way children lived in those earlier eras, decades ago. I used to work at Father Flanagan's Boys Town, in Nebraska. Father Flanagan's Boys Town was established because, he as a parish priest found no other alternative. There were children living in cardboard boxes on the streets of Omaha, so he began an institution to provide some home for those boys.

Now over the years that may have gotten too large and too impersonal and costly but the original impulse was basically to help.

I think we see cycles where things that start off with good motives, but maybe 10 to 50 years later need to be reformed, rebuilt, or reestablished. I think that is the era we are in now. We don't want to go back to an era when people lived in cardboard boxes on the street because there was no one to care for them.

Senator DENTON. Of course not. There is no question that we have to address the problem. I am not sure that with the approach that we have now that we have anything like an ideal approach.

Dr. GARBARINO. Absolutely.

Senator DENTON. All we are going to get out of today's hearings is a sense of direction in which to further investigate. I am not going to draw any simplistic conclusions.

Did you want to comment on that, Mr. McKnight?

Mr. McKnight. Yes.

Senator Denton. I was going to ask you some questions now.

Mr. McKnight. Well, I am troubled by this last comment.

Mr. Woodson. So am I.

Mr. McKnight. I am trying to—I understand the problem that has just been described. However, I have lost all my tolerance for the argument because I see what happens under the strength of that argument with policymakers facing those points. Policymakers are finally told, yes, we know about all the problems of this industry, right? "But after all, we have to keep children out of boxes."

Now, it's that argument that I see always growing to strengthen the middle that we have been talking about, the middle part of this system, the part where kids are not at home and are not adopted.

Senator Denton. So there are two points of view and two perspectives on how much weight to give to this or that nuance, and we better not pursue the debate into the details of that now.

However, we will pursue it in terms of the findings which you submit to us and through the rest of our study.

Mr. McKnight, we would all agree there is an interrelationship, an interdependence among the units Mr. Woodson has referred to as mediating structures. From your study of neighborhoods, have you found any evidence of change in the relationship between family and the neighborhood, family and the community? Would you characterize those changes as positive, or negative? Elaborate in any way you see fit on that.

Mr. McKnight. We have recently done a study of crime and perceptions of crime in 13 neighborhoods and in three major American cities over a year's time, trying to look at how people understand crime. That is, how fearful are they? What do they do about it?

And then we looked at the data in terms of the nature of the crime that they actually experience in victimization. The thing that is very clear in that study is what I think we have seen before, this is just one case on point. That is, in those neighborhoods where you have a set of strong primary institutions of the mediating structure type, especially in strong neighborhood organizations—I don't know how it is in your State, I am really talking about the big cities in the Midwest that I know—that when you have those strong neighborhood organizations at the neighborhood level, with these organizations usually composed of the mediating structures, they are composed of the local small businessmans associations, they are composed of the local churches, they are composed maybe of the parents organizations associated with the school, it's like a congress of the neighborhoods, the primary institutions. When you find an organization like that that's alive and well and representing its constituencies there is less crime, you see there is less fear, you see people on the streets rather than fearful to be on the streets.

So some people argue it's cause or effect, but I want to go back to the point I was making before. If you can develop policies that will support neighborhood organizations rather than institutions that are keeping children who are victims of this, I think you will have made a great step.

Could you have a hearing for neighborhood organizations? See, we need to turn to groups at that level and say, "What can you do? What can we do to help you?" Maybe most of what they will tell you is what you should stop doing.

Senator **Denton**. In line with Dr. Garbarino's previous diversion into sort of an opposite emphasis, I think he would agree that—I hope he would agree—that perhaps we have developed a national feeling starting in the last 20 to 25 years that the Government should be doing things for us that we should really be doing for ourselves at the neighborhood/community/familial level?

I believe that that sense of independence, of self-reliance was very much a part of the formation of the ground work of the philosophy of the people who founded this country and who did so ingeniously, and which even the Encyclopedia Britanica, when they looked at the men who sat down and wrote the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, they do so with respect bordering on awe in terms of the scholarship, contemplation, philosophy, and so on applied.

Those were men who were among those who had no government a few years before to do anything for them. They had to do it themselves on the basis of neighborhoods, communities, et cetera. They had to do it against the elements, they had to do it against starvation, they had to do it when they came over here against a sea voyage which was incredibly dangerous.

Somehow, having become, let's face it, affluent—although there are very poor among us—we are incredibly saying, as we start to discuss our national problems, saying things like dire poverty.

We are the richest nation in the history of the world. What we are perceiving as poverty today, when I was a kid wasn't. It is self-defeating to expect that Government can provide more and not go bankrupt. It is self-defeating to expect more in terms of what should be considered necessity. I have lived in roach-infested hotel rooms all of my youth, I didn't like anything about it, but there was no way to get rid of the roaches. I read about this now in the prisons. The people who are living in the Federal prison are a lot better off than I was in the places I lived, and I was relatively well off. My family was upper middle class, I guess, financially.

Poverty is a problem we must address, but it isn't our biggest problem today. In the family, one learns respect for the comparative political efficacy of this Government—then you don't get some one saying, "Hell no, I won't go." I don't mean to raise the Vietnam thing again, but I am talking about patriotism. You learn this in the family, and there is no country that deserves it more than this one and to have an opinion out there that is generally opposite to that with too large a segment of our population, is morally wrong, and I am sorry I got off on this subject.

Dr. **Garbarino**. Senator, could I just say a couple of things? My own research has focused on the role of neighborhoods in child abuse which I know is a topic of interest of yours. Like the findings for crime, the results for child abuse indicate that a strong neighborhood support network means we have less child abuse. Families are supportive, help each other out. I think that is the fundamental thing that we are talking about creating. My only concern is that we don't look for the wrong bad guy here.

One of the most important forces undermining neighborhoods often is the policy of large corporations. They may decide, for example, to close a plant because it makes sense in some corporate scheme, without any concern for the effect on the community. Those, I think, are the big dramatic actors. I think, my own work has focused on ways to use professional resources to augment and support neighborhood functions so that when the beautician that was mentioned before comes up against a problem she can't handle—and we have documented that they do—she has somebody to turn to, not somebody dictating to them what to do but somebody that may give them another perspective.

That is separate from this whole child custody industry question. Any big industry, whether it's human services or making cereal, is probably going to result in some unfeeling, insensitive kinds of decisions. So one of the big questions is bigness. You talked about the founding of our country. Our country was built on small communities.

Our Nation's founders were not in charge of enormous bureaucratic organizations. They were in charge of small farms, small businesses, and those organizations give you a perspective on dignity that I think bigness does not.

So, one of the themes that you ought to consider from that point of view is breaking down bigness and going for the smaller scale things that allow people to deal with others as people, not as numbers.

Senator DENTON. Certainly, I agree with the general philosophy in the context of the argument that large corporations should regulate their businesses in a way not to disturb the things you are talking about.

Mr. McKnight, what specific components, funds, leaders, plants, et cetera, need be present in order for a community to solve its own problems? Where would you place the emphasis?

Mr. MCKNIGHT. Well——

Senator DENTON. If you look at things like the United Way and so forth, a tremendous involvement of time, commitment of capacity by men who by virtue of having gotten where they are, they had to have a nobility of spirit or they would not have been able to get along with their colleagues.

Mr. MCKNIGHT. The question is about business participation?

Senator DENTON. What would you emphasize to be present to enable the community to solve its own problems? Funds? Leaders? Planners?

You touched on this before.

Mr. MCKNIGHT. I want to again say I am talking about city neighborhoods and lower income city neighborhoods. I understood that that was mainly the focus here. There, I think, a primary issue is a minimum adequate income and that assumption—it's my experience that if you have a group of people with adequate income that they are not in awful much need of professional help. I see an inverse relationship there. The more sound and just the economy in those neighborhoods, the less you need professionals, the less you need planners, land clearance experts, and the more the neighborhood organization grows and has that internal capacity.

That may not be very satisfying to you, but there is no substitute for that.

Senator DENTON. No; I fully agree with you. I do not take issue with that at all.

Do you have a comment, Mr. Woodson?

Mr. WOODSON. Yes. Even if there were adequate income, John, in order for those neighborhoods to develop, I think there is a difference between "growth" and "development." I learned this from John McKnight and his colleagues. You can move a plant into a neighborhood and hire 2,000 people and a year later that plant could move and everybody's back where they were. That's growth. But if you talk about development of that community, you are talking about ways of determining what are the consumers, what is the market in that neighborhood, and how can that market opportunity be met by enterprises within that neighborhood that will stay there and spend that money so that the dollars that are spent are recycled and turned over those 12 times as they are in a healthy neighborhood.

People in those neighborhoods, regardless of the source of income, spend their money on something. Most of them spend it outside of that neighborhood, so you don't have the recirculation of those resources.

I think most of the groups that I am studying and working with throughout the country have on their agenda ways of taking the entrepreneurial interest, there present, and concentrating that into some commercial activity that will generate income. For that they are looking for creative ways to establish partnerships with corporations.

I think of the 500,000 small businesses that start each year, 80 percent of them fail. Those that survive provide 60 percent of all the new jobs. We just have to find ways of reducing the mortality rate of those that fail, because many of them are in those same neighborhoods.

To do that we need to transfer some of the problem solving capacity of corporations to neighborhood level economic development entities where they determine how they can make best uses of these resources.

Senator DENTON. Don't all three of you see a bourgening realization on the part of business that urban renewal, getting businesses back downtown even at the sacrifice of some efficiency, is a long-range economic benefit to them because social disintegrations cause disadvantages to them? Is that not something that we should encourage along the lines of Dr. Garbarino's remarks?

I would certainly think that this is a new and very encouraging development.

Dr. GARBARINO. I think one of the issues that this raises in talking about family, is something that touches so many of the other legislative missions in this Government.

We are talking about tax policies that make it advantageous to writeoff neighborhood plants; we are talking about urban development policies where there are all kinds of fiscal incentives to run over old neighborhoods.

So although we are talking about the family, so many influences on its health come from outside to directly affect family-related concerns.

Senator **Denton**. Gentlemen, thank all three of you very much. I believe that your testimony today will be extremely useful and I hope that our findings will be studied at beyond this subcommittee.

Mr. **Woodson**. Thank you.

Mr. **McKnight**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator **Denton**. It is my understanding that Dr. Salk is scheduled to be our last witness, but that he must catch a plane, and that Sister Symons and Mr. Williams do not have the same problem. May I ask their permission or approval for us to take Dr. Salk next?

Dr. Salk, if you would come forward, please.

STATEMENT OF DR. LEE SALK, CORNELL UNIVERSITY MEDICAL CENTER, NEW YORK CITY

Dr. **Salk**. Mr. Chairman, the family is the key social unit within which human beings learn a sense of self-esteem and develop the skills for being able to cope with life's problems later on. It's only through feeling important to at least one person in the course of early growth and development can a human being learn to love—and to gain a sense of self-worth sufficient to become a useful member of society. I have no doubts that people who have felt loved during early life are far more capable of loving others in adulthood, while those who experienced emotional neglect will learn not to trust, will have difficulty expressing love, and will be vulnerable to other emotional problems.

In my years of practice as a psychologist, I have learned that every destructive or violent act committed by one human against another can be traced to things that happened in that person's early development.

Interestingly enough, when we hear of a serious crime, a murder, or an assassination attempt, we immediately become curious about the early life of the person who has committed the act. Journalists immediately probe into the person's early behavior, performance at school, and position in the community to find an explanation or to find out what went wrong.

The major problem facing families today is that they seem to have less and less time to spend with one another, and have in a sense defaulted in the responsibilities that were once a family matter. With far less parental time available to children, schools have been expected to provide the main structure in a child's life—as well as his discipline and punishment.

With the little time families do have together, many of them spend an inordinate amount of it in front of a television screen. In this way, human, moral, and social values are heavily influenced by the material on the screen. And since more parents work today, and there is such reliance on the one-way communication that takes place with a television set, there is less opportunity for the kind of talking, listening, and human responsiveness that is essential to the nurturance of positive human qualities.

The stresses on family life today are of deep concern to me. The pressures, the anguish and the rapid bombardment caused by accelerated changes in everyday life post a threat to the mental health of future generations. While I am optimistic about the outcome, the ability we each have for coping with the multitude of problems we face daily depends upon our ability to remain in contact with our humanness.

While the stresses of life may be more intense today, the problems we have are basically no different from those of other times. What is different is that our fears and anxieties have been intensified by the mass media. Television not only brings the gory elements of death right into our living rooms, but makes us face the realities of the nuclear age. The anxiety this creates, however, is far less devastating than the desensitization it causes: We have become numb to human tragedy. It is unlikely that we will ever be able to eliminate completely the tragic outcome of human destructiveness, or that we will be able to prevent all the misfortunes we encounter in the course of life.

In spite of all the stresses and the negative elements in modern life, I believe this is a fascinating time to be alive.

There is greater openness and honesty about life. Subjects that were totally taboo, even 10 or 15 years ago, are now often dealt with directly and matter of factly. Years ago, for instance, pregnancy was not only unmentionable as a topic in polite conversation, but pregnant women avoided being seen in public during the advanced part of their pregnancy.

Today we no longer treat pregnancy as an illness, but we also accept the curiosity of children and their questions about reproduction.

The women's movement has helped raise the consciousness of all of us, and has directed us to reexamine traditional male and traditional female roles. This has not only given women the opportunity for more options than were available 20 years ago, it has served to let men be more involved in rearing children, and to give them a more active share in household responsibilities.

Over the past 20 years, the traditional role of the father has undergone profound changes. Old assumptions of father as breadwinner and disciplinarian continue to break down as we see more and more fathers becoming involved in their children's lives, pushing baby carriages down the street, getting up for the morning feeding, openly expressing their warmth and tenderness.

In the process of researching a forthcoming book I am doing on fathers and sons, I have confirmed my feeling that the father-son relationship is basically characterized by love and affection rather than the more commonly held theory of aloofness, competition, and conflict.

A common complaint presented to me by children these days is, "My mother and father are too busy to listen to me."

I urge people to use the time they spend with one another in a psychologically useful manner. Mealtime is incredibly important. It should be a time when everyone talks and listens, expresses interests and frustrations, and cooperates in making family decisions. If family mealtime is combined with television watching, it becomes a tragic loss to a potentially useful family experience.

The pressures of life today cause parents to push their children into many responsibilities before they are ready for them.

In our culture, we have a very low regard for emotional dependency. We sometimes force our children to go out there and deal with life's problems, without any help from us. To need assistance is viewed as a weakness. But by forcing our children to be independent before they are ready, we have in many ways weakened their capacity to form close relationships in which there is mutual dependency.

I am very impressed by the fact that young people today are looking for close ties with one other person. There seems to be a resurgence of the desire to share, to want physical closeness, and to be open and honest about their expectations of one another. Nothing could enhance our society more than having people who want to live together, love each other, and enjoy sharing. Many of the conflicts that today lead to divorce will in the future be talked out before marriage. I am convinced that more and more people will approach their relationships and commitments in a way that is going to be considerably more honest than it has been in the past.

I have found that many parents who have little time to spend with their children feel guilty about not providing the kind of parental contact their children need. Most people recognize the shortcomings of any substitute for a strong, meaningful, caring relationship with at least one parent.

In the future I am sure we will see changes that enable working parents to have enough flexibility to meet the demands of their work without compromising the emotional health of their children—or without neglecting the relationships between themselves.

Flexible working hours, job sharing, family travel together on business trips, and the mandatory permission by employers to allow parents to attend school conferences and special events in which their children participate will be among the changes to take place.

I would like to see a major publicity program launched by the most effective publicity or advertising organization to enhance the image of children, to make the family something that we really respect and I would like to help direct it. We need to be constantly reminded that our children are our greatest asset, the key to the future of our civilization.

If as a society we consider the family an important unit, we must make changes in the practices of institutions to support and enhance the family in the United States of of America.

Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Salk and supplemental questions and answers follow:]

TESTIMONY BY DR. LEE SALK[*]

to the

UNITED STATES SENATE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGING, FAMILY, AND HUMAN SERVICES

on

PRIMARY INTERVENTION IN SOCIETAL PROBLEMS: THE ROLE OF THE FAMILY

Thursday, September 17, 1981
Dirksen Senate Office Building - Room 4232

The family is the key social unit within which human beings learn a sense of self-esteem and develop the skills for being able to cope with life's problems later on. Only through feeling important to at least one person in the course of early growth and development can a human being learn to love--and to gain a sense of self-worth sufficient to become a useful member of society. I have no doubts that people who have felt loved during early life are far more capable of loving others in adulthood, while those who experienced emotional neglect will learn not to trust, will have difficulty expressing love, and will be vulnerable to other emotional problems.

---

[*] Clinical Professor of Psychology in Psychiatry,
Clinical Professor of Pediatrics,
The New York Hospital-Cornell Medical Center
New York, New York

In my years of practice as a psychologist, I've learned that every destructive or violent act committed by one human against another can be traced to things that happened in that person's early development. Interestingly enough, when we hear of a serious crime, a murder, or an assassination attempt, we immediately become curious about the early life of the person who's committed the act. Journalists immediately probe into the person's early behavior, performance at school, and position in the community to find an explanation or to find out what went wrong.

The major problem facing families today is that they seem to have less and less time to spend with one another, and have in a sense defaulted in the responsibilities that were once a family matter. With far less parental time available to children, schools have been expected to provide the main structure in a child's life--as well as his discipline and punishment. With the little time families do have together, many of them spend an inordinate amount of it in front of a television screen. In this way, human, moral, and social values are heavily influenced by the material on the screen. And since more parents work today, and there's such reliance on the one-way communication that takes place with a television set, there is less opportunity for the kind of talking, listening, and human responsiveness that is essential to the nurturance of positive human qualities.

The stresses on family life today are of deep concern to me. The pressures, the anguish and the rapid bombardment caused by accelerated changes in everyday life pose a threat to the mental health of future generations. While I'm optimistic about the outcome, the ability we each have for coping with the multitude of problems we face daily depends upon our ability to remain in contact with our humanness.

While the stresses of life may be more intense today, the problems we have are basically no different from those of other times. What _is_ different is that our fears and anxieties have been intensified by the mass media. Television not only brings the gory elements of death right into our living rooms, but makes us face the realities of the nuclear age. The anxiety this creates, however, is far less devastating than the desensitization it causes: we have become numb to human tragedy. It is unlikely that we will ever be able to eliminate completely the tragic outcome of human destructiveness, or that we will be able to prevent all the misfortunes we encounter in the course of life.

In spite of all the stresses and the negative elements in modern life, I believe this is a fascinating time to be alive. There is greater openness and honesty about life. Subjects that were totally taboo, even ten or fifteen years ago, are now often dealt with directly and matter-of-factly. Years ago, for instance, pregnancy was not only an unmentionable topic in polite conversation, but pregnant women avoided being seen in public during the advanced part of their pregnancy. Today, we no longer treat pregnancy as an illness, but we also accept the curiosity of children and their questions about reproduction. The women's movement has helped raise the consciousness of all of us, and has directed us to re-examine traditional male and traditional female roles. This has not only given women the opportunity for more options than were available twenty years ago, it has served to let men be more involved in rearing children, and to give them a more active share in household responsibilities.

Over the past twenty years, the traditional role of the father has undergone profound changes. Old assumptions of father as breadwinner and disciplinarian continue to break down as we see more and more fathers becoming involved in their children's lives, pushing baby carriages down the street, getting up for the morning feeding, openly expressing their warmth and tenderness. In the process of researching a forthcoming book on fathers and sons, I have confirmed my feeling that the father-son relationship is basically characterized by love and affection rather than the more commonly-held theory of aloofness, competition and conflict.

A common complaint presented to me by children these days is, "My mother and father are too busy to listen to me." I urge people to use the time they spend with one another in a psychologically useful manner. Mealtime is incredibly important: it should be a time when everyone talks and listens, expresses interests and frustrations, and cooperates in making family decisions. If family mealtime is combined with television-watching it becomes a tragic loss to a potentially useful family experience.

The pressures of life today cause parents to push their children into many responsibilities before they're ready for them. In our culture, we have a very low regard for emotional dependency. We sometimes force our children to "go out there" and deal with life's problems--without any help from us. To need assistance is viewed as a weakness. But by forcing our children to be independent before they're ready, we have in many ways weakened their capacity to form close relationships in which there is mutual dependency.

I'm very impressed by the fact that young people today are looking for close ties with one other person. There seems to be a resurgence of the desire to share, to want physical closeness, and to be open and honest about their expectations of one another. Nothing could enhance our society more than having people who want to live together, love each other, and enjoy sharing. Many of the conflicts that today lead to divorce will in the future be talked out before marriage. I'm convinced that, more and more, people will approach their relationships and commitments in a way that's going to be considerably more honest than it has been in the past.

I've found that many parents who have little time to spend with their children feel guilty about not providing the kind of parental contact their children need. Most people recognize the shortcomings of any substitute for a strong, meaningful, caring relationship with at least one parent. In the future I'm sure we will see changes that enable working parents to have enough flexibility to meet the demands of their work without compromising the emotional health of their children--or without neglecting the relationships between themselves. Flexible working hours, job sharing, family travel together on business trips, and the mandatory permission by employers to allow parents to attend school conferences and special events in which their children participate will be among the changes to take place.

I would like to see a major publicity program launched by the most effective publicity or advertising organization to enhance the image of children--to make the family something that we really respect and I would like to help direct it.

We need to be constantly reminded that our children are our greatest asset--the key to the future of our civilization. If, as a society, we consider the family an important unit, we must make changes in the practices of institutions to support and enhance the family in the United States of America.

September 17, 1981
Hearing on Primary Intervention in
  Societal Problems
Supplemental Question for Dr. Lee Salk

Senator Denton: In your judgment, what kind of preventive services could be offered to keep families strong and functional?

DR. LEE SALK, clinical psychologist, 941 PARK AVENUE, NEW YORK, N.Y. 10028, 861-4448

October 16, 1981

Senator Jeremiah Denton
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Denton:

This letter is in response to your letter of September 28, 1981 asking for my suggestions on the kind of preventative services which could be offered to keep families strong and functional.

I would recommend that we encourage classes in elementary school for children as early as third graders to focus on and emphasize family life. The emphasis should be on the need for people in families to talk to one another, listen to one another, help one another and give one another a feeling of importance. I would focus more on openness of feelings, sharing and decision making than on obedience and punishment.

When there is a need for child care in a family due to death, divorce or economic necessity emphasis should be placed on having someone help in the home rather than sending the child to a day care center. When children are under the age of three they need a great deal of individual time and attention and a feeling of closeness within their family, especially a one parent family. It is not only better psychologically but far more economical from a funding point of view. In order to facilitate such a program we would need to establish some form of certification for child care workers as well as training.

I believe parents should be mandated to attend periodic conferences with a child's teachers, attend school events in which their children participate, and that employers be mandated to give permission for working parents to leave work on such occasions. The procedure for doing this could be similar in principle to that which occurs for jury duty when employers must permit employees to comply with that responsibility.

I would like to see children and their accomplishments, particularly artistic and intellectual, be highlighted in parades whether they be in celebration of national holidays or community events. I deplore the use of children in beauty contests for such purposes. And while some communities highlight athletic achievements, I believe we must recognize children's artistic and intellectual abilities even more.

I personally feel that since children have no vote they have no political power. For this reason, I would recommend that serious consideration be given to the establishment of a Cabinet position which focuses on children. More than four years ago I made this recommendation in a communication to President Carter. Unfortunately, I received no response in spite of a series of attempts to get one. For whatever purpose this may serve, I'm attaching copies of the letters concerning this matter. This will help you understand my reasons for making this suggestion.

It is very difficult for me to give you more specific suggestions than those above in view of the fact that the position of children and of the family in America is of very little concern to industry and government. For this reason, I had suggested in my original testimony to you on September 17, 1981 that we engage in a major advertising and public relations program to raise the status of children and the family by the methods industry uses to sell their products so effectively.

I want you to know that I deeply appreciate your interest in my views and the opportunity you've given me to present them to you. If I could be of any service again, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely yours,

Lee Salk

Lee Salk, Ph.D.

LS:dd

Senator **Denton**. Thank you very much, Dr. Salk. I am happy to agree with your valuable observations, A hearing was conducted by the Judiciary Committee on juvenile delinquency by Senator Specter, detailing the experience of a witness who was the founder of what is called the Guardian Angels up in New York, and his analysis of the root causes of the problem of juvenile delinquency dealt generally with the thrust of your remarks, and more specifically with the problems with which television plays such a major role, namely, the establishment of role models for youth. It is a difficult thing to sit here and know that three broadcasting corporations, innocent enough in their natural preoccupation with profit, are not presenting what you might call ideal role models for our children.

Now, a Government can't do much about that without being accused of censorship, but if a publicity campaign of the type you are talking about by which a network chairman of the board might be persuaded that in the long term, say 10 years, his profits, the profit of his advertisers, et cetera would be greater were we to have a more solid family unit in which these educational developments that you referred to take place, maybe they would come up with the money for public service announcements.

How do you perceive such a publicity campaign being paid for?

Dr. **Salk**. I am not a businessman, I am just not sure, but there certainly are foundations that work toward the goals that we are discussing here today. It would seem to me that if they could see the value of such a program that I think it would be a very economical approach to the problem.

I think we all know that when you are dealing with something of value, something we all hold in high regard, all the organizational problems seem to work in the direction of solution to the problems concerning that valued thing. If we hold children in high regard, truly see them as our most valuable assets, somehow or other the programs we are talking about in Government will work. We are going to have fewer and fewer problems implementing the kinds of ideas I think that are in the best interest of our society in that type of environment.

That is—how many of us buy products we don't want simply because we are bombarded by advertizing or even develop attitudes about things we know nothing about because somebody has put forth a great deal of money using the various technical advances we have today, the media among them, to change people's attitudes.

In World War II when there was a shortage of certain kinds of meat, the survey research center at the University of Michigan evaluated a program which focused on changing people's attitudes about eating organ meats and brown bread. If we can take those same techniques and apply them to the family, I am sure that program development will begin to move much more rapidly.

Senator **Denton**. How can the Federal role be altered to increase the solidarity of the family or protection of children? We have all sorts of programs involving poverty, child abuse, child neglect and so forth, and as you heard there is much concern that we may be usurping the parents' role to the point where they become unconscious of what their role should be.

I want to make sure that we can get from you every positive recommendation that you can make in this direction other than that publicity campaign to which you referred.

Dr. SALK. I think I have to answer you perhaps in a conceptual way rather than in terms of very specific programs. But I truly believe that self-esteem is the most important thing a human being can achieve in life. It is from that that we can prevent drug abuse. When a person feels a sense of self-worth, that person doesn't want to destroy something that he or she cherishes. Clearly, people who commit violent acts have a low sense of self-esteem. I have seen this in residential treatment settings that I have worked in.

I would like to see people develop a sense of self-worth, feeling of power, feeling of participation. People have to feel that they are being considered.

I think what makes people feel good on election day is that they have said something important through a ballot, and if you look at people's expressions as I do when people come out of the polling place, it looks different than the expression they had when they had gone in.

I think we all need to feel that we are involved in the decision-making process. I urge parents to discuss problems with their children. Frequently in April and May, parents call me and ask "Should I send my 7-year-old to camp? and my reply is," How does your 7-year-old feel about it?" The answer is usually "I haven't asked him."

"Well, why don't you ask him?"

The parents response is, "It never occurred to me."

Parents don't ask children about things, and hence, don't know how they feel; and the child feels, what's the use of talking, they're not going to listen to me anyway.

This is why they turn to other groups or what I would call family substitutes, maybe gangs, cults, various other organizations that provide them with a sense of self-esteem, a feeling of being important that they are not getting within their own families.

Let me add this is not a problem that is restricted to poor people. This is a problem that afflicts all levels of our society which tells me that money is not the only problem but attitude is.

It is our attitude toward our children, attitude toward the communication process with one another. Now, I haven't really answered your question.

Senator DENTON. No, you have. Self-esteem brings me back to something that seems to have preoccupied the founders of this Nation and the philosophy which included a tremendous regard for that point and many observers of our system from non-Americans as well as those who set our system up, thought it very keen that we set rights, using terms with utmost reliance on Divine Providence and all agreed pretty much that there was a spark of the Divine in each one of us, that we are created in the image and likeness of God. This may or may not be a prevalent belief now, but it certainly was in those days.

I think it insured by principle, by philosophy, that this Government should never lose sight of that which we share, which makes us almost infinitely important individually, unique, but important in that sense.

I deplore that we have gotten away from that original principle.

Dr. SALK. Let me add to my last remarks in order to be more specific about what could be done by Government. A few months ago I was invited to speak to the Congressional Wives Task Force. I must have sparked a moment of hope when I suggested that families travel together, for example, that legislators undergo many, many family problems simply because there is so much disruption with so little time legislators can spend with their families. I felt that if perhaps every third trip or fourth trip were to be funded by—whether it be industry or whether it be Government—so that that family could travel together. That would be not just bringing the family together but that a statement would be made by those institutions we respect, Government, industry, and even hospitals, for example. I have for more than 20 years been trying to convince hospitals to allow fathers into the labor room and the delivery room. I have been urging hospitals to allow children to come and visit the mother and the new baby right after the baby is born, not to be excluded.

All these have a human quality of togetherness. I think this would serve to imprint family unity if we could only establish practices like this.

Recently in a speech to a hospital administrators group I suggested that the first meal after the birth of a baby be arranged so that a little round table be wheeled into the mother's room, candlelit, perhaps, with a bottle of wine and enabling the mother and father to sit together and celebrate the growth of their family.

It may sound foolish or overly romantic but I think those are experiences and statements which can affect people's attitudes, instead of the rather cold, clinical approach being used in hospitals today.

Senator DENTON. Well, I concede that if the Department of Energy can pay for commercials talking about saving energy, if the Department of Defense can pay for commercials permitting the various services to say things like join the Navy and see the world, or that the Marines need a few good men, and things like that, with the state of affairs existing which we are discussing today, that some department within the Government could more than justifiably help finance a program which talks about or advocates some of the specifics as well as the generalities which you refer to here today, because it is a matter of public perception. It is a matter of consciousness and so this overall committee of which I am a member, and the Department of Health and Human Services may be the right one to at least initiate some of those.

So I will pursue the Government's appropriate position in that and try to advocate it.

Thank you very much, Dr. Salk, lots of luck in catching your plane.

Dr. SALK. Thank you.

Senator DENTON. On the next panel we have two witnesses, Sister Carol Symons, Neighborhood and Family Service Project, Julie Community Center, Baltimore, Md.; and Mr. H. Chris Williams, president, Sun Belt Institute of Human Factors, Research and Development, located in my own hometown of Mobile, Ala.

It is a pleasure to welcome both of you; Sister Symons, would you begin, please.

STATEMENTS OF SISTER CAROL SYMONS, NEIGHBORHOOD & FAMILY SERVICE PROJECT, JULIE COMMUNITY CENTER, BALTIMORE, MD., AND H. CHRIS WILLIAMS, PRESIDENT, SUN BELT INSTITUTE OF HUMAN FACTORS, RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT, MOBILE, ALA., A PANEL

Sister SYMONS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am Sister Carol Symons, I am the coordinator of the health promotion program at Julie Community Center, and I am also a member of the Neighborhood and Family Services Task Force of Southeast Baltimore.

I believe that initially I have to ask, "What is the long-term effect of constant crisis on families?" As a result of an initial period of research, the task force focused its energy on families—and many of our families do not fit traditional patterns—and we established two major objectives for the development of all of our programs.

First, that we would attempt to strengthen the community helping system, that is to say, the clergy, neighborhood leaders, natural helpers, church groups, schools, community groups, et cetera.

And, second, that we would provide a linkage between the informal community helping networks and the existing human service agencies.

It is important to point out here that the process of bringing community residents in a low-income neighborhood together with professionals in collaborative models is particularly sensitive, for neighborhood people often do not trust their own experiences and insights and defer instead to those with more formal education. For the staff involved in the implementation of the neighborhood of family services project, this required a basic empowerment style, patterns of continuous support, strengthening and skiil building among the residents in order that they might work effectively side by side with agency personnel.

Through the years a number of projects have been undertaken by the task force and I have described them more at length in my written testimony, but the first was the neighborhood and family day picnic which was begun in 1977 which has since become an annual event. Then we held the communitywide family workshop to inform residents of local resources available as well as to assess needs of families in the area.

A hotline has been in operation since 1978, and trained volunteers with the backup of local agencies provide information and referral to families seeking help.

CHEN, the Community Health Education Network, is directed by a board of community residents and local agency professionals. CHEN sponsors a number of programs and activities through which people are encouraged to help themselves and to help one another. Each year a forum is held to identify needs and directions. The forum is at once a working session and a celebrative community event. CHEN sponsors monthly bus trips for senior citizens and periodic programs for families of the area which involves the local community psychiatry programs.

These programs have focused on stress, on family dynamics, and communication, on helping families deal with neighborhood problems. Currently we are offering a program to assist natural helpers in the community deal with people suffering from depression.

Peace at Sundown is a program whereby neighborhood residents with the backup of hospital social workers offer support to families who have lost a loved one.

The task force has also sponsored a number of activities to promote dialog between the community residents, the clergy and the agencies. One seminar in particular focused on youth in southeast Baltimore. There are also monthly luncheons in which community helpers, clergy and agency representatives discuss actual case presentations in order to develop new resources and alternatives for helping.

Another program, "Keeping Families Talking Together," was cosponsored by the task force, Associated Catholic Charities and a neighborhood school and church. In January 1980 a Neighborhood Helpers Conference identified and brought together and formalized the existing network of clergy, agency and neighborhood helpers.

Also in 1980 the task force was involved in planning and implementing the White House Conference on Aging, the Miniconference for EuroAmerican Elderly.

In addition to the work of the task force, a variety of support services are provided by the Julie Community Center, including a Peoples Rights Office, and a Health Promotion Program which trains neighborhood residents to function as health promoters so that they can, with the support of health professionals, assist families who are experiencing health problems.

The housing component of Julie Community Center is known as Jubilee Baltimore, and it is working to protect the rights of low-income families threatened by displacement. Jubilee Baltimore has developed a model of cooperative ownership of multifamily dwellings and has trained the residents to control and to manage the units.

Julie Community Center also sponsors programs for youth as well as other programs designed to enhance the quality of life of families and these programs are possible largely because of the voluntary efforts of people both from within and without the community.

[The prepared statement of Sister Symons follows:]

My name is Sister Carol Symons. I am the Coordinator of the Health Promotion Program at Julie Community Center, and I am also a member of the Neighborhood and Family Services Taskforce of Southeast Baltimore. I would like to share with you the programs and activities which these two organizations are providing for the families of Southeast Baltimore. However, it seems important initially to identify the context of these programs, i.e. to describe the neighborhood in which we are living and working.

Southeast Baltimore is an area of the city characterized by wide ethnic and racial diversity including: Germans, Poles, Ukranians, Russians, Irish, Native Americans, Spanish-speaking peoples, Appalachians, Vietnamese, Koreans and others. There is a growing population of older citizens who are living on fixed incomes, and a significant number of families who fall below the poverty line. Illiteracy is a problem in our area; many people have limited educational backgrounds, and some cannot read or write. The unemployment rate is generally above average, and our area of the city is one which is experiencing the effects of urban revitalization. This has both positive and negative ramifications for our people.

In 1976 the Neighborhood and Family Services Project was initiated under the auspices of SECO (the South East Community Organization) through a grant from the University of Southern California, Washington Public Affairs Center through funding from the National Institute of Mental Health. (A twin project was also established

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

on the Southside of Milwaukee, under the auspices of the South Community Organization.) Under terms of the grant, the project was to be a "four year research and demonstration effort aimed at strengthening neighborhood and family life by identifying and transforming obstacles which prevent community residents from seeking and receiving help", (It is important to note here that although the grant terminated in 1980; nevertheless, the process has essentially continued through the collaborative efforts of neighborhood people and human service agencies.)

Through the years the project has been directed by a group of community residents who comprise the Neighborhood and Family Services Taskforce. The function of this group has been to examine the problems of the Southeast Community as well as the resources available to meet those needs, particularly mental health needs. A Professional Advisory Committee was also formed to provide assistance to the Taskforce. This committee was composed of representatives of nearly every human service agency serving the Southeast area.

The initial phase of the Neighborhood and Family Services Project was a period of research concerning the following questions: "What personal problems are people experiencing? Where do people go for help when they have problems? How and when do people make use of helping networks? What are the obstacles to their seeking and/or receiving help? How do the factors of ethnicity and community attachment intervene in the process of defining problems and utilizing helping networks? This research involved surveys of community leaders and residents, as well as statistical data.

When we, of the Neighborhood and Family Services Taskforce, began

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

to study the research data and to measure it against our own experience of the neighborhood, we saw clearly that the problems confronting our people were problems of survival --that rents absorbed most of the monthly income and left little for food and medicine, that even food stamps did not supplement adequately to feed families for a month, that houses were overcrowded and deteriorating, that there were barriers to people receiving adequate health care. (And if the conditions were bad in 1976, how much do we have to look forward to as the budget cuts take effect!!) We asked ourselves: "What are the long term effects of constant crisis on families? And we became critically aware that so many of the people live with a sense of frustration and powerlessness because they experience their economic situation as fixed and debilitating, because lacking education they do not have resources or see alternatives. We became conscious that this powerlessness is manifest at times through apathy and more often than not through the eruption of violence in the community and in the family where the more fragile members are the ones who suffer the most -- the elderly and children.

In addition to focusing us on families and on the breakdown of families, the research also pointed up the high level of need in the community which could not be responded to by professional agencies because, of their nature, they were fragmented. And there was also a gap between the agencies and community helpers, and this was a major obstacle to people seeking help. Furthermore, people were not making use of the many strengths that did exist within the community, and therefore, support system building needed to begin on a neighborhood level within the community itself.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

As a result of the research analysis and reflection, it was determined that all programs and activities developed by the Neighborhood and Family Services Taskforce would meet the following objectives: 1) to expand and strengthen the community helping system (clergy, neighborhood leaders, natural helpers, church groups, schools, community groups, etc); 2) to provide a linkage between the informal community helping networks and the existing professional helping network (human service agencies). (It is important to point out here that the process of bringing community residents together with professionals in a collaborative model is particularly sensitive, for neighborhood people often do not trust their own experiences and insights; they defer instead to those with more formal education. For the staff who were involved in the implementation of the Neighborhood and Family Services Project this required a basic empowerment style, patterns of continuous support, strengthening and skill building among the residents in order that they might work effectively side by side with agency personnel.)

The first project which was undertaken as a result of the research was the Neighborhood and Family Day Picnic held in 1977. (This has since become an annual event.) The picnic was designed so that families could spend an enjoyable, relaxing day together without spending much money. Entertainment and games were free, and food was served at minimal cost. The event was a collaborative effort of the Taskforce and the Professional Advisory Committee, and during the picnic local human service agencies provided information about their programs.

In 1977 the Taskforce also sponsored a community-wide Family

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Workshop designed to inform residents of local resources available to families as well as to assess needs of families in the community so that support programs could be developed. Several active committees comprised of neighborhood residents and agency representatives developed out of this workshop: a Hotline Committee, a Health Education Committee and a Family Communications Committee.

By March of 1978 a Hotline was effective within the community. This Hotline is operated by trained volunteer neighborhood helpers who provide information and referral to persons seeking help; these helpers in turn receive back-up and support from local agencies.

CHEN (the Community Health Education Network) is an outgrowth of the Health Education Committee. Directed by a Board of community residents and local agency professionals, CHEN is responsible for a number of programs and activities through which people are encouraged to help themselves and to help one another.

Each year CHEN conducts a Forum in which neighborhood residents and health professionals identify needs and directions for the future. At the same time that it is a working session, the Forum is also a celebrative community-building event, providing people with experiences which serve to promote the health and well-being of the participants.

CHEN also organized monthly bus trips for senior citizens so that people who were often isolated and homebound might have opportunities to socialize as well as to do some shopping. Originally these trips were funded by the City; however, the money ran out last October. Since then, residents of the community have initiated bake sales and other fundraising events to reactivate the program. The trips will

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

resume this month with a minimal charge to the participants.

In collaboration with the Community Psychiatry Programs of Johns Hopkins and Baltimore City Hospitals, CHEH also conducted several programs for area residents. The first series focused on Stress and was entitled: "What's Bugging You?". At the end the people were asked to identify other needs, and a Family Dynamics Workshop was planned to help families improve their communication and interaction skills. This workshop moved easily into a new series entitled: "Life on Julie Street" which was designed to help families deal more effectively with neighborhood problems. Another program is currently being offered to assist natural helpers in the community in their dealings with persons suffering from depression. All of these sessions have taken place in the evening in conjunction with a covered dish supper. Consequently, they have provided for the people a relaxing community-building experience as well as an educational opportunity. One of the effects of these programs has been a breakdown in the stereotype image of mental health professionals and in the stigma associated with treatment. As a result, neighborhood residents are more actively seeking help with problems related to mental health. (However, at the same time that we are uncovering more people in need of these services, so also are the funds being cut back on the providers, and this is creating a dilemma.)

CHEH was also instrumental in getting a pharmacist in the neighborhood to accommodate the evening and weekend needs of families in the area.

Another activity of CHEH was the organization of a small babysitting cooperative for mothers who were feeling the need of such a

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

service occasionally.

"Peace at Sundown" a joint effort of the Neighborhood and Family Services Taskforce and the Social Work Department of Baltimore City Hospitals, is a program that provides support to families who have recently lost a loved one. Neighborhood helpers visit the relatives of deceased patients and then meet monthly with the hospital social workers to discuss cases, evaluate, and plan the program's future. Periodic training sessions assist neighborhood helpers to understand better the needs of families coping with death and bereavement.

In 1978 a day-long seminar was held for the purpose of fostering dialogue among area clergy, agencies and community helpers. This was followed by a second seminar focusing on Youth in Southeast Baltimore.

As a follow-up to these meetings, the Community/Clergy/Agency Committee decided to continue the dialogue process through monthly Brown Bag lunch / Case Seminars. The luncheons are held at different agencies or churches and begin with a presentation of the services of the host agency. Then community helpers, clergy and agency representatives discuss actual case presentations in small groups. The result has been a sharing of mutual concerns and issues and the development of new resources and alternatives.

Another activity in 1978 was a workshop: "Keeping Families Talking Together". This program, co-sponsored by the Family Communications Committee of the Taskforce, Associated Catholic Charities, a neighborhood school and a local church, was designed to strengthen family life through the development of skills in problem-solving, in communication, and in effective listening. Not a typical skills workshop, it focused more on the neighborhood in that it dealt

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

with single parenting and grand-parents raising children in a low-income environment. (It should be stressed here that all of the activities of the Taskforce have accommodated in some way a broader definition of families and have included extended families and widows and widowers as well.) The result of this workshop was that people shared problems with each other, learned from one another, felt relieved and surfaced ideas for future workshops.

In January 1980 a Neighborhood Helpers Conference identified, brought together and formalized the existing network of clergy, agency and neighborhood helpers which the Neighborhood and Family Services Project had started to create.

The White House Conference on Aging / Mini-Conference for Euro-American Elderly was conducted in 1980 in two cities: Baltimore and Cleveland. Its purpose was to bring together older persons of Euro-American backgrounds to discuss their needs in relation to government programs and to help to build up national policy that would not work against the elderly but which would support the self help already going on in ethnic areas. The Neighborhood and Family Services Taskforce had input into the agenda and helped bring people to the Conference who were truly representative of older Euro-Americans in an effort to present a more credible report and not simply an academic perspective. In this context the Taskforce surfaced some of the self-help activities going on in ethnic neighborhoods in an effort to develop national policy.

As a means of financing programs, especially the Hotline, the Neighborhood and Family Services Taskforce created a Fundraising Committee and sponsored raffles, dinners and other events.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In 1980 the funding for the four year grant expired and the staff positions which had been assigned by SECO for the development of the program terminated. However, the Neighborhood and Family Services Taskforce decided to continue meeting while the Professional Advisory Committee restructured itself to form the Southeast Human Services Network. Currently, the Hotline remains in operation; CHEN is an active planning Board, and the Clergy/Agency/Community dialogue continues. Consequently, the residents of the area continue to assess needs and determine directions while the representatives of the various human service agencies essentially provide the staff assistance necessary for the implementation of the programs. (It should be noted here that programs directed by neighborhood residents are not only viable and maintain, but they are also cost effective and labor intensive.)

In addition to the work of the Neighborhood and Family Services Taskforce, a variety of other programs and support services are provided to the families of the area by the Julie Community Center. Furthermore, members of the Center are significantly represented on the Taskforce, and many of the Taskforce programs are conducted at the Center.)

Julie Community Center was founded in 1975 to respond to the needs of the people in the area. Its first undertaking was the organization of a Peoples' Rights Office designed to help families and individuals obtain the benefits to which they are entitled. Through the work of the Peoples' Rights Office a number of major health problems in the area were identified , as well as the fact that many families, for one reason or another, were not receiving ade-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

quate treatment.

As a result Julie Community Center initiated its Health Promotion Program in 1976, a process which has continued to the present day. Neighborhood residents, health professionals and students from Johns Hopkins and other universities meet together on a weekly basis to share information about health problems, to develop skills such as taking pulse, respiration and blood pressure, and to discuss the experiences of the people. The goal of this program is to authenticate the life experience of residents in such a way that they can assume responsibility for their own health and that of the community. As a result, residents are now functioning actively as Health Promoters both in informal interactions with family members and neighbors, and in formal situations where they work in advocacy roles with families who have been referred to the Center with health problems. In their role as Health Promoters they work with the back-up of the health professionals involved in the weekly meetings and in particular with the Community Health Nurse assigned to the Center by the City Health Department.

Julie Community Center has also been concerned with the housing problems experienced by families in the area, with the high cost of rents, with the virtual inaccessibility of public housing because of excessively-long waiting lists, and in particular with the plight of low-income families who are being displaced through the process of urban renewal. (It seems important to underscore the seriousness of this problem for low income residents. When their economic situation is such that they cannot get through the month without facing some kind of crisis, the support systems of extended family and com-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

munity are all the more necessary. Consequently, families who are displaced as a result of "gentrification" experience separation and isolation which for them is critical.)

In 1977 when large numbers of families were receiving eviction notices because of the resale of properties, Julie Community Center worked with other groups in the area to establish an organization known as Concerned Citizens of Butchers' Hill. Concerned Citizens is actually a program of cooperative ownership which enables low income families to direct and manage the multiple family dwellings in which they are living. Eleven homes were purchased primarily through contributions from churches and other groups within the private sector, and were rehabilitated through a HUD 312 loan of $190,000. The families involved are now beneficiaries of Section Eight subsidy. A significant function of the Julie Community Center staff has been to foster community development among the families of Concerned Citizens and to train them in group decision-making processes and in management skills.

As a result of this experience, Julie Community Center has now created a new and more extensive housing organization known as Jubilee Baltimore. The purpose of this organization is to develop other projects based on the model of Concerned Citizens in the Southeast Baltimore area and also to form a network of groups concerned about housing issues more broadly. Jubilee Baltimore has been awarded $100,000 in Housing and Community Development Block Grant money for the purchase of houses.

In addition to the programs already named, Julie Community Center also sponsors activities for the youth of the area and a variety of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

other events which are designed to strengthen community bonds and to enhance the life of families in the neighborhood.

As a general rule, Julie Community Center relies on the private sector for its support, on donations from churches, groups and individuals, and on grants from private foundations. A part-time staff position is provided to the Peoples' Rights Office by the Maryland State Commission on the Aging, and the Center also receives $10,000 in operating expenses from HCD Block Grant money. It is directed by a board of fifteen members, the majority of whom are residents of the neighborhood.

9/17/81

Submitted by:

Sister Carol A. Symons SND
230 S. Patterson Park Ave.
Baltimore, MD 21231

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Senator **DENTON**. Thank you very much, Sister Symons.

Mr. Williams, I would like to welcome a fellow Mobilian. Having noted you were a football coach at one time, I solicit any comments you might make on Alabama's loss to Georgia Tech. Alabama was No. 2, Georgia Tech had a 1-9 record last year. Do you have any observations on that one?

Mr. **WILLIAMS**. Well, I just think the pressure was on the young Alabama team, who maybe thought they were a little better than——

Senator **DENTON**. Only two seniors on the team; isn't that correct?

Mr. **WILLIAMS**. Right. It's a young team, and Georgia Tech was fired up, so to speak.

Senator **DENTON**. Yes. Alabama must have been pretty tensed up, and Georgia Tech was more or less playing for fun. But go ahead.

Mr. **WILLIAMS**. Mr. Chairman, after 20 years in the educational and social service programs, I have founded my own institution which I call Sun Belt Institute of Human Factors Research and Development, and it is a private education firm dedicated to human fulfillment. It was founded on the concept that most people have the built-in desire to realize more of their potential; and to become more effective and efficient in many areas of their lives.

Though its development and process addresses several entities within American life, such as education, Federal, State, and local government funded programs, and businesses and industries, this report is centered on the family, especially the poor and minority; and how these family oriented services, funded by government, can become more effective and efficient in serving the needs of the traditional, one parent, or large and extended families in today's society.

The concepts and techniques developed by the Sun Belt Institute, SBI, can address the family through evening or weekend seminars and they are designed for the participants to easily apply them in their daily lives. Whether addressing the traditional, one parent, or large or extended families, adult family members and their older children, 15 and above, should also attend so as to focus on the advantages of strengthening their family unit through setting goals, and plans to achieve these goals, and to seek positive alternatives when reaching those goals are threatened by negative turn of events.

The seminars are designed for the family unit to gain greater insight and understanding as regards to each member's attitude, self-image and self-esteem, their goals, and the extent of each one's motivation within and outside of that family unit, as well.

SBI's seminars are designed to stimulate and strengthen the mental and emotional attitudes and values so that people become more vibrant in their daily lives. The concepts and techniques presented to participants easily enable them to develop their own powers, which literally helps them get out of their own way. Too many of the services offered by federally funded social service programs for the underprivileged or disadvantaged has created an addiction for the ever-growing need to spend more tax dollars both on the part of the personnel who develop, implement and guide these programs, as well as the participants themselves.

Very little attention has been given to an on-going program which instills pride and dignity in self-development and accomplishment in participants making the determination to self-sustain themselves by positively seeking other than alternatives through employment, et cetera.

Additionally, very little attention has been given to the concept of an over-a-period-of-time program which alerts the participants that at a specific point in time he or she will be expected to stand on their own two feet and make their own way.

The welfare reform program which is now being phased out came closest in this effort. However, it is time to stress that there is no possible future in these programs for any individual who is physically and emotionally able to take care of himself or herself. Subsequently, SBI makes the following proposals: One. That upon entry into all social service programs that an extensive orientation program be instituted for not only the person applying for assistance, but for members of the family as well, and of the age to comprehend the materials presented at the orientation. This will bring about, especially for the single parent, and for the poor families, the importance of their knowing the position of the status of their family at that particular time; and that they are first of all, people, or a family, who are working towards moving out of that particular situation and that it's only temporary.

Two. Participants who are in programs of assistance be given a recertification period to reevaluate their efforts in working toward their independence, and who will also be given advanced or intermediate orientation.

In the welfare system in Alabama, there is a recertification period, done by telephone sometimes, sometimes it's done by mail. At that particular point of time, there should be a recall of those persons to come in and to, more or less, explore areas for potential employment, and to also orientate and to motivate them not to give up, and to encourage them to go back and try and get the job which will make their conditions better. This should be a constant process, this orientation for succeeding, "you have to work at it." "You can't give up." This should be a constant reminder to all participants in welfare programs.

Three. To utilize the community education concept in neighborhoods where schools are now empty as a result of integration, especially in Mobile, and in Georgia and Tennessee, where I have also worked. Since integration minority or black students have been bused out of their community to schools as far as anywhere from 5 to 10 miles away. School buildings are still in those communities, or in those neighborhoods, that are not being utilized by the local government or by the State government.

I am saying that these schools and facilities can be utilized for family orientated programs and programs of that nature in the evenings as well as on weekends.

I also propose that these kinds of programs can work closely with local school systems and community and junior colleges. My reason for identifying these institutions is that the 4-year universities already have a tremendous task and they are often located in communities removed from poor or minority families, but community or junior colleges are often located within, or not far from, some of the poor minority neighborhoods.

Persons who receive financial assistance should have the responsibility to attend those program if stipends or supplements are to continue. Offerings should be of such that working families should also be encouraged to attend.

Four. In the unemployment offices around the country, as well as in welfare offices, you see hundreds of people, or sometimes 50 or 60, just sitting looking glassy-eyed waiting their turn to meet with workers. I am suggesting that in these facilities some kind of video process be developed and implemented which can motivate them; and give them job tips, rather than their sitting there just waiting their turn. If we have become a society oriented to television, I think that this media should be utilized to the advantage of everyone and in every way. Video program tapes could be developed which are geared to welfare recipients or the unemployed not only to give informative tips on job finding, but they should also be entertaining programs for those clients waiting. You can never tell what will happen as a result of this process.

Five. There should be greater efforts at a cooperative venture between government, and business and industry, in the ongoing support of minority businesses within those targeted areas.

The corporations and everyone is concerned about unemployment, but none are, it appears, looking at the small business person who can expand his or her business. If they can hire three or four people in a legitimate business they will not only become more independent, but they will also be giving people jobs. I think that is one of the things that we have to turn to in this country right now. There is not enough emphasis on the development of small businesses within any one particular community. I am speaking of legitimate privately owned businesses, not federally funded hand-out programs, but people and businesses who can market a product, and there are many in Mobile, who are small business people, and they are hurting. Small businesses do not have representation. Everyone who goes on TV, expressing concerns about social or business programs, are either talking about the wealthy, or the poor. There is a group, a great number of people who are trying to make it on their own, and little or no attention is given to these people as a resource to pull certain neighborhoods and certain communities out from down under.

I am one of those who believe that this country is going to turn around economically only if it places more emphasis not on corporations, but on the development and expansion of the small businessman and woman so that they can grow and hire people. This will then alleviate the welfare or unemployment rolls. I think that large corporations are somewhat saturated, as regards to employment and production.

Finally, SBI is interested in further development of programs within poor and minority neighborhoods and the community at large which centers on innovative concepts which have been tested and proven and will not duplicate existing services.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Williams follows:]

REPORT TO
THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE
ON AGING FAMILIES AND HUMAN SERVICES

THE PRIMARY INTERACTION
IN SOCIETAL PROBLEMS

SEPTEMBER 17, 1981

SUN BELT INSTITUTE OF HUMAN FACTORS,
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
951 GOVERNMENT STREET, SUITE 422
MOBILE, ALABAMA 36604

(205) 432-8320

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUBJECT PAGE

I. General Description 1

A. Background and Rationale of Services

- Concepts in Social Behavior 2
- Research and Development 3

B. Federally Funded Programs for the Poor and Minorities

- An "Unenlightened Industry" 4
- The Challenge of Addressing the Real Problem 5
- As A Man Thinks So Does He Act 6
- Federally Funded Programs on the Local Level 10
- National Organizations for the Poor and Minorities on the Local Level 12

C. Sun Belt Institute -- A Small Business

- Thesis Summary on Economic Rejuvenation and Recovery 14
- SBI's Potential 15

II. Goals and Objectives 18

A. Educational Institutions and School Systems

- Staff Development and Training 18
- Student Orientation 19

B. Federal and State Funded Programs 19

C. Businesses and Industries

- First and Second Line Supervisors and Other Employees
- Sales and Marketing 20

I. GENERAL DESCRIPTION, BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE OF SERVICES

H. Chris Williams founded SUN BELT INSTITUTE OF HUMAN FACTORS, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT as a private educational firm to serve educational institutions, school systems, government programs, and businesses and industries. His experience in human resource development as an adminsitrator, instructor, program coordinator and developer, has involved working with personnel on all levels of administration, management and labor in staff relations.

As founder of SUN BELT INSTITUTE (SBI), he consistently directs the firm in addressing the positive rewards of harmoniously utilizing multicultural human resources readily available in the Sun Belt region of the United States. He encourages the development of these resources into a cohesive force for further growth and prosperity; and further emphasizes the need for individual and collective self-accountability on the job, in the community and society in general.

As president of his firm, he is a highly sought speaker and seminar leader for self-fulfillment training; having directed training seminars at educational institutions, school systems, agencies and organizations throughout the Southeast. He presents tried-and-true methods and ideas that can be put to work immediately. He has authored several written works on multicultural development and positive growth in the South, as well as the manual which accompanies his seminar, "Guide and Recorder to Achieving Your Potential."

A. Background and Rationale of Services

1. Concepts in social behavior

SBI began its work as a private educational firm, dedicated to human fulfillment, in May, 1980. It was founded on the concept that most people have the built-in desire to realize more of their potentials and to become more effective and efficient in many areas of their lives. It began by offering Fulfillment Seminars services to educational institutions, school systems, federally funded social service programs, businesses and industries, as well as week-end seminars to persons who were concerned about their own personal and professional development.

The concepts and techniques learned in the seminars were designed for the participants to easily apply them in their daily lives. Additionally, the seminars were designed to assist: a.) employers in quest of more cooperation and production from their front and second line supervisors, or other employees; b.) educational or social service administrators, business or industrial supervisors who desire improved performance from their team or group; c.) employees who are in quest of upward mobility on the job and in salary; d.) instructors in quest of more cooperative efforts with their students, so the latter will achieve more academically; and, e.) retirees or older citizens who want to begin a second career, etc.

SBI seminars are designed to stimulate and strengthen mental and emotional attitudes and values, so that people become more vibrant in their daily lives. The concepts and techniques presented to participants easily enable them to develop their own powers, which literally help them to "GET OUT OF THEIR OWN WAY."

2. Research and Development

In the area of research and development to educational institutions, SBI concentrates its services on: a.) student recruitment program for colleges and universities; b.) student seeking vocational or professional alternatives; and, c.) a study of students educational, social and economic background and environment so as to assure that students goals are in harmony with the goals of the post-secondary institution they desire to attend.

Opportunities for research and development for businesses and industries are exceptional. However, this process is still in its embryotic stage. Some potentials in this area are: a.) recruitment of quality skilled and unskilled labor for companies, corporations, etc.; b.) develop an on-going register of all graduating seniors of post-secondary institutions and schools in the Southeastern region of the United States, to match their educational training, skills, etc., with the demands of business and industry, et al., and vice versus.

SBI views a great need in our society today, a need for more individual, cooperative and positive planning in the lives of too many people; coupled with the need for greater and more qualitative performance, productivity and self-accountability on every level of our society and in every walk of life. This is the need that gave birth to the firm, and its development and growth are nurtured by its consistent quality performance in the delivery of its service.

The concepts and techniques embodied in SBI'S overall process is not relatively new, but it is innovative in that a "minority" firm is implementing them. SBI, through a process that reaches out and down to every level of of society, is actively addressing, with positive results, a "back to basics" trend that is long overdue.

B. Federally Funded Programs for the Poor and Minorities

1. An "Unenlightened Industry"

With the initiation and implementation of the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), in the mid-nineteen sixties, the hope of the poor and minorities was awakened by voices from the nation's capital resoundingly encouraging them that they too will obtain upward mobility, socially and economically, as the result of the development of programs which would assist them in their struggle. From the hopeful and early beginnings of OEO, federally funded programs have evolved into a social industry which is "unenlightened" and denies the participants who are served by a variety of social programs pride and dignity in their desire and quest for upward mobility. These participants find themselves in a quagmire of well intentional but self-defeating social programs which are more of a symbol of what they can not accomplish rather than what they can.

In short, many federally funded social service and educational programs, designed for the "underprivileged" or "disadvantaged" have created an addiction to the need for megabucks in order to survive, both on the part of the personnel who develop and implement these programs as well as the participants themselves. Little attention has been given to an on-going program which instills pride and dignity in self-development and accomplishment in participants making determinations to find a place in the sun within the American economic system, without the on-going and perpetual support of the tax dollar. Additionally, except for SBA Programs, little attention is given to an "over-a-period-of-time" program which alerts the participant that at a specific point of time he or she will be expected to stand on their own two feet and make their own way in the American system. There is no positive future, in these programs, for any individual who is physically and emotionally able to take care of him or herself.

2. The Challenge of Addressing the Real Problem

Guided by sixteen years of experience in addressing the challenges of federally funded social service and educational programs, H. Chris Williams, President of SBI, has observed that many of those persons who are served become addicted to those programs. Somehow, the innate urge to have pride and dignity in their own self-development and achievement in an ever changing society has been arrested by dependency and apathy. In other words, their rhetoric and action imply they cannot make it without consistent annual support of federal dollars. This is not intended to infer that in many quarters federal support, which must address the changing thrust of supply and demand, is not needed. But, must these tax dollars be utilized in abundance for social programs from the cradle to the grave? Without any end in sight? And, Must dollars be doubled annually in order for persons, institutions, agencies, or organizations to survive? It is time to return to square one.

SBI espouses and actively addresses the practical concept of the American economic system to refute those claims above, especially to those people who have become addicted to social service programs, at every opportunity. The dynamics and practicality of the economic system have taken a back seat to socially oriented programs, which are well meaning in design, but they fall short in instilling pride, dignity and the quest for independence in individuals; and they promote a child-like attitude about America's economic system -- No one receives something by giving nothing, except his/her name, address, ethnic origin, etc.

Through study, SBI has observed that a mere fifteen percent of the U.S. Public, who have defined success in their lives and achieved it, actively read and write their own formula for success and a great portion of that percentage attend numerous motivational seminars in their lifetime; or they travel in a "power group". The remaining eighty-five percent, of which at least thirty-five percent are identified as poor and minorities, do not attend willingly, or do not have the money to attend high powered and well directed seminars. Coupled with the fact that these citizens are exposed more to, what can be termed as, a "weak" environment, few have the opportunity to associate with or be included in a "power group" which can strengthen their sense of purpose and objectivity within the synthesis of the American economic system. As a result of these observations and need, SBI has designed a seminar in human fulfillment which "Everyman" can understand and apply effectively in his or her daily life; and which can motivate him or her to achieve more of their potentials in their quest of economic and social upward mobility.

SBI, as a firm and process, though it has not realized it full potential in service and financial development, is a living example of what can be accomplished if one has the initiative, ability, skill and tenacity. And, it drives home and reinforces the point, these qualities, and more, must be learned, developed and then applied daily, if one is truly in quest of upward mobility in this country. This is the challenge of addressing the real problems of the poor, minorities, and social programs.

3. As a Man Thinks So Does He Act

What social programs have not addressed or concentrated on is the fact, "As a man thinks so does he act." If a person sees him or herself in a never ending circle of poverty and welfare they think and act accordingly. The same is true of the "underachiever" in education, criminals, et al. In other words, one of the sources of the problem is the use of self-deprecating terms in identifying and addressing the challenge. Words used by those persons who think they know their own (parents, relatives, civil rights leaders,etc.), or the "experts" (social scientist, social service staff, teachers, etc.), in many instances determine the poor and minorities attitude, self-image, goals, and even their motivation within programs supposedly designed for them. Since many of these persons are from a poor environment, which is more negative than positive, they have been, and are, easily impressed with their own shortcomings, or failures. That is why they are dependent on someone else to determine their well-being, or social programs for their survival.

In addressing the thesis of "As a man thinks so does he act", SBI guides participants, of all ages and from every walk of life, in its seminars, to actively follow four aspects and self-determining factors in their lives, if they desire to achieve more of their potentials in their quest for their success.

a. attitude -- is simply defined as how an individual thinks or feels about something, and when he/she has an attitude about something he/she goes in that direction. If he/she "lock-on" to a positive attitude he/she feels good about himself/herself and he/she "locks on" to the negatives within and outside of himself/herself. Attitude is the predictor of future performance of every individual; it is a "sure-enough" principle. This means, each individual sees what he/she expects to see; hears what he/she expects to hear; and, think what he/she expect to think. In other words, each individual's attitude predicts which direction he/she will or will not go. If the individual "locks on" to the "sure-enough" principles of "I can't", "I don't", "I don't need", "Why try", etc., which are negatives, he/she "locks out" options in his/her attempt to achieve his/her potential or success. If he/she "locks on" to the "sure-enough" principles of "I can", "I choose to", "I want to", "I will", etc., which are positive, he/she immediately "lock-out" all negatives about himself/herself and his/her environment. In the latter example, each individual begins to see options open or available to him/her which he/she never saw before, and this is the self-fulfilling importance of having a positive attitude. Too many of the poor and minorities are not aware of the fact that mental obsessions have physical manifestations. This challenge must be addressed extensively and effectively.

b. self-image -- is simply defined as the way he/she see himself/herself. It is the TRUTH as he/she see it at any given time -- It is what he/she expect from him/her. The self-image is the accumulation of all thoughts, attitudes, and opinions each individual has perceived, from experience or others in his/her environment, and stored about himself/herself in his/her subconscious mind. The subconscious picture an individual has of himself/herself is stored as a result of what he/she thought, or think, he/she perceived about himself/herself and the world around him/her and this picture controls how he/she think and perform. Whatever an individual has stored in his/her subconscious as to his/her potential, or whatever, about himself/herself and is it is vividly imagined, experienced and feel that it is actively happening, whether real or not, it is stored in his/her subconscious as "REALITY". The subconscious does not know the difference between something REAL and something IMAGINED as real. The result is, once he/she has vividly imagined an experience it is recorded in the subconscious and he/she is stuck with it until he/she CHOOSES to displace it. If he/she CHOOSES TO make changes in his/her self-image, he/she must use positive imagination to create a new subconscious picture of himself/herself to bring about the change he/she desire. ALL MEANINGFUL AND LASTING CHANGES START

FIRST IN THE SUBCONSCIOUS AND THEN WORK THEIR WAY OUT INTO REALITY. Federally funded social and educational programs failed, somewhat, in addressing this fact, that is why they have not experienced the success for which they were designed or intended.

c. goals -- are pictures visualized by an individual as an end. Each individual is drawn toward pictures, and if he/she really wants what is in the picture badly enough everything else that is in the way becomes trivial. There are twelve areas of an individual's life which makes up his/her "Big Picture". SBI'S approach in addressing these twelve areas is to have each individual examined his/her present life style and determine if his/her goals all fit together in terms of "total life" balance. The integration of his/her life into a meaningful "Big Picture" is important to their further development personally, vocationally and professionally. If the individual is under-emphasizing, or over-emphasizing, the value of some of the important parts of his/her life, this in most instances, is the source of the problem. Once he/she has clearly focused on his/her "Big Picture" he/she can make deliberate preparations for a pre-determined outcome without complete dependence on someone else or social programs.

d. motivation -- is intrinsic synergism (inward energy or action cooperatively working with mind and body) which drives an individual toward pictures (goals). There is nothing mystical or magical about learning to develop more of an individual's potential, just as there is no great secret to motivating himself/herself and those around him/her with dignity. The key to all motivation is for him/her to see the pay value and personal profitability in reaching a desired goal. There are two kinds of motivation, Constructive and Restrictive, used to achieve goals. Restrictive Motivation centers on the threat of force, or "have to's". Constructive Motivation is absent of any threat or force, it centers on "want to's". SBI guides the individual in realizing that Constructive Motivation, or motivation based on, "I want to" rather than "I have to", is the better method of achieving his/her potential. Constructively, when he/she clearly sees the pay value or profitability in doing something he/she does not give up self-accountability by blaming others. Each individual's happiness and success are their responsibility and he/she must make the deliberate decision about his/her life, and as a result he/she must accept the consequences of making that choice. In Constructive Motivation, the creative part of the subconscious works for each individual to creatively move with drive and energy towards that goal which he/she truly desire. This is the forgotten message of what America's interpretation of the "pursuit of happiness" means, and is not positively addressed in federally funded social and educational programs.

4. Federally Funded Programs on the Local Level

When OEO placed the Head Start Program in the field, in the summer of 1965, the Archbishop Toolen's Antipoverty Committee, which was formed in the spring of that year, was the first non-profit organization in the State of Alabama to receive a federal grant to implement the program. While coordinator of the Head Start Program in Mobile, that summer, H. Chris Williams, under the direction of the Vicar of Catholic Charities, the acting arm of Archbishop Toolen's Antipoverty Committee, began working on a proposal to receive a grant from OEO, for its Community Action Program (CAP). This led to the organization of the Mobile Area Community Action Committee, now Mobile Community Action, Inc., which evolved as the controlling agency of Head Start and several other social programs which followed. Initially, state and local officials, though they reluctantly endorsed the Toolen program, had an overall hands off policy, but as the federal money pot began to swell with more and more dollars they had no other choice but to join the race to Washington. First, came the Manpower programs, the forerunner of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA); then increased welfare benefits; revenue sharing, et al.

The evolution of federally funded programs, on the local level, can be termed nothing less than a psychosomatic phenomena. The interrelationship of the thoughts and feelings (psych) of public officials, the poor and minorities (body), determined they take federal dollars (medicine) to cure the symtoms of inequity, social unrest and overall paranoia. The local theme appears now to have been, apply for as many grants as possible; get the funds; and social problems will be resolved. Using this approach, quality programming and implementation was sacrificed at the expense of the quanity of dollars rendered. Subsequently, federally funded programs, on the local level, took on the personality and character of elected public figures and hand picked advisory boards whose goals and objectives were inconsistent with the programs design, as well as the needs of poor and minorities. Local program goals were watered down as a result of political in-fighting to control dollars, thoughts, personnel, the overall process, and program effectiveness.

As a result of the rush for federal dollars and local control, creative and innovative concepts were lost in implementation of local programs, because local officials and advisory boards did not utilize all of the community's human resources effectively, extensively and across the board. Political camps evolved from within and without the local programs either for or against the smallest program detail. Persons emerged as presidents, directors, supervisors, secretaries, et al., who had gained the support of one camp or another and this also created problems in program effectiveness. Inevitably, programs designed for the poor and minorities lost themselves in a sea of local controversy, confrontation and misdirection. Emphasis on the dollar and control took precedence over performance of both staff and participants. An era of "Give me, America" began and the ethics of working toward the pursuit of happiness" was forgotten. This major dilemma must be addressed and corrected in social programs.

5. National Organizations for the Poor and Minorities on the Local Level

In focusing on national organizations for the poor and minorities on the local level, SBI brings attention to fact that while these organizations makes every effort to expose social and economic inequities of the poor and minorities, they give little or no attention to the development of minority businesses and industries in the private sector. When they speak of jobs in the private sector they refer to discrimination, or what corporations are not supporting minorities. There has not been an organization, nationally or locally, that has thrown full support in the development and growth of minority businesses and industries in the private sector. In this instance, they are like the leaders, advisory boards and staff of the federally funded programs mentioned above. Their character and personality reflect the leadership's desire to obtain more federal funds and thereby maintaining more control over their constiuents and delivering gospel like messages through the news media as to what the poor and minorities need. What the poor and minorities need are jobs and the less emphasis on social programs the better; the more emphasis on jobs in the private sector, especially in minority owned businesses and industries, the better.

It is a reality, social programs as they exist at this time are self-defeating in the poor and minorities making social and economic gains toward self-reliance and independence, which fosters pride and dignity. There is a tremendous need for these organizations to take a new direction by focusing and drawing attention to the national economic necessity of minority businesses and industries further development and expansion, so they can serve more people, employ more people and thereby filling an economic void, nationally and locally, in minority communities and in the private sector. It is the time for less rhetoric about the need for social program and the need for action that will create more minority businesses and industries and expand the growth of those already in existence.

Small firms, similar to SBI in idea and potential, have tremendous growth potential and need attention and action on their behalf in order to assist in the rejuvenation and redevelopment of the American economic/employment system. Financial investment by government, small and large corporations, national organizations, et al., are at least returnable and have profit-making potential. SBI contends that sizeable investments in small and minority businesses and industries in the private sector will inevitably alleviate the strain of supporting federal social programs at the expense of the tax dollar and will wind down inflation and the unemployment rate. Additionally, financially support of these kinds of programs will not need cancerous and staggering "cradle to the grave" funding which means small and minority businesses and industries will stand on its own two feet and makes its own way in the American system. This is the bold new direction national organization should espouse in their desire to assist the poor and minorities in their present struggle for survival.

Investments in these kinds of programs, among others features, should take in consideration their potential for growth in service, financial returns, personnel employed and its location.

C. Sun Belt Institute -- A Small Business

1. Thesis summary on economic rejuvenation and recovery

There are thousands, perhaps millions, of small or minority businesses or industries like SBI, who have a commodity, know there is a market, yet do not receive the attention, financially or otherwise, the big corporations and federally funded social and educational programs receive from the national government. These small firms in quest of survival, further growth and development may well be a major part of the answer to reversing the economic trend which prevails today; and which is staggering under accelerated inflation; and which has slowed down investments; and which has increased unemployment and welfare rolls indefinitely. What is needed is an honest effort on the part of govenment with large corporations or investment firms to implement dynamic programs in the area of economic development for small businesses -- a "buddy system" or "big brother system". Owners of small and minority businesses and industries are still unable to pay the price of country club membership, or a arrange a golf match where many of the largest financial deals are made by the conglomerate directors, etc.

As for the Small Business Administration (SBA): The SBA loan program, as it exists now, in effect, does not extend substantial assistance to small or minoritiy businesses or industry. The loans granted are not adequate and that is the major reason many small businesses fail within two to three years. Apparently, as they reach a point in their business where they can experience growth their funds are depleted and they can not grow -- in business you grow or die. In every business venture there are unforeseen dilemmas. New and developing small or minorities must take risks in order to survive, and the risks are not as great in the beginning as it is over a period of one to three years, because the business must seek constant growth and this entails risks which are unforeseen in the beginning stages. Yet, SBA, in many instances, determines mismanagement as another potential business, which it financed but inadequately, fails.

SBI contends, it is more sound for the government, corporations, national and local organizations, et al., to invest more dollars in small or minority businesses or industries which can employ the very people for which social programs are designed. This concept should be piloted in the field nationally for a one to three year period and every aspect should be tested before acceleration begins. This was and is the dilemma of present social programs. Urgency is not always compatible with success, just as big is not always better.

2. SBI'S Potential

SBI'S potential lies in the area of human services. Its continuing development and growth in human service encompasses many facets of today's life in social and educational programs, and in business and industry. There is little doubt that such a firm is needed, especially in the Southeastern region of the United States. The fact that SBI is a private firm dedicated to human services and whose process emanates from the private sector gives it latitude in serving people from all walks of life and background; without strigent guidelines or regulations as to who it serves. This process allows for service to individuals of every age and from every walk of life who are in quest of achieving more of their potential, regardless of income and status. This process of addressing service to heterogenous groups allows SBI the opportunity to focus on the advantage of each individual, in attendance, to respect and even admire the accomplishments of others within the group.

A person serviced by SBI, through their own efforts, or through their institution, system, agency, business or industry, is guided to focus on his or her potential and recognize the need for balance in their total life's picture, through bringing their personal, professional or vocational and other life's goals in harmony with their attitude, self-image and motivation, and the world around them.

SBI'S potential for service and financial stability, returns and gains, centers on the following:

a. Educational institutions and school systems (see goals and objectives, beginning page 18).
  - staff development and training (Title III and Teacher Corp Funds)
  - student recruitment (colleges and universities) and orientation (colleges, universities and school systems) Title III and Teacher Corp Funds).
  - research and development (Title III)
  - parents of students or neighborhood groups (Teacher Corp)

NOTE: State and local educational funds are also utilized in promoting these kinds of programs. Also, see appendix, pp. 5a-14a for recommendations and evaluations of SBI in serving institutions and school systems.

b. Federally funded social programs (see goals and objectives)
  - staff and participant development and training, nationally and locally (CETA, Private Industry Council, et al).

    - community organization staff and advisory councils, etc., (Community Action Agency, Head Start, et al)

c. Business and Industry

    - first and second line supervisors and other personnel
    - sales and marketing personnel
    - business and industry community councils, et al

d. Week-end seminars for people of all ages and from all walks of life (see appendix, p. 15a)

    - families
    - first career persons
    - second career persons

SBI has an effective and far-reaching process which encourages participants to achieve their potential. And, it has identified a market; has in place a process to meet the needs of that market; and the experience and know-how in promoting its services. SBI contributes a weekly column on human fulfillment in one of Mobile's local minority newspapers, entitled "Voice from Within" (see sample article(s) in appendix, pp. 16a-18a). It also has a ninety second spot on a local radio station, WBLX, in Mobile, which corresponds with the weekly article (see sample in appendix, pp. 19a-20a). Since the radio spot is treated as a public service announcement, SBI needs to buy time in the audio/video media, so it can market its services for greater effect in growth and development. In growth and development, SBI can employ talented and hard working people, many of whom are probably unemployed. Multiple SBI efforts in growth and development times thousands of other small or minority businesses and industries and there exists another entity to absorb or lighten the unemployment and welfare rolls.

II. GOALS AND OBJECTIVES OF SUN BELT INSTITUTE'S SERVICES

Today many Americans are concerned about their future and the future of the country. SUN BELT INSTITUTE (SBI) addresses the challenge of today's life by taking the positive attitude that no matter what the situation is today, very little progress can be made, individually or collectively, as long as there exist the persistent delusion that: 1.) someone or something else is going to come and save us from ourselves; and, 2.) if we are not immediately and visibly saved then that someone or something else is to blame. Through its seminars, SBI directs that we can change the pattern of being a nation of people living apart as strangers, to ourselves and others around us, when we begin to care more about our individual and collective potential for ongoing growth and development. SBI reinforces this concept through developing and implementing a positive, effective and far-reaching process, which assist individuals and groups in dissolving their fears and frustrations through self-fulfilling concepts and techniques which addresses their attitude, self-image, goal setting, and self-motivation. The development of positive attributes in these intrinsic areas of life, individually and collectively, can propel this country to make even greater progress economically, socially, educationally, politically, and even spiritually, than in its past history.

A. Educational Institutions and School Systems

1. Staff development and training

The seminar for educators, administrators and staff is designed to instruct each participant in fulfilling himself/herself personally and professionally in their educational environment. It also directs them to better understand the nature of his/her role in the institution and school system, and to better cope with the challenges of his/her profession.

2. Student Orientation

The seminar for senior high school and college aged youths, as well as young adults is designed to instruct each of them in fulfilling himself/herself personally, professionally or vocationally in their home, school, college or work environment. It also directs them to better understand the nature of his/her role in life as they begin the challenge of life's fulfillment; and in positive harmony with all of those persons who will assist them, as well as all others with whom they come in contact with now and in the future.

B. Federal and State Funded Programs

The seminar for persons in low income/minority communities, and the related program staff which serves them, begins a positive step in personal and/or professional/vocational fulfillment in their immediate living or working environment. Both groups will begin to get a better understanding of the nature and relationship of each other's role, as they begin to cope in a positive way with the challenge of improving their daily lives, and in harmony with each other.

C. Businesses and Industries

1. First and Second Line Supervisors and Other Employees

The seminar is designed to instruct supervisiors how to improve their skills in administering their duties through relating and directing their personnel in a positive and constructive manner for greater performance. It will also emphasize how they can prevent complaints and avoid discipline problems. The pay off will be supervisors who better understand the nature of his/her managerial role and develop sharper skills in coping with the many challenges of his/her supervisor's job.

2. Sales and Marketing

   The seminar for persons in sales and marketing is designed to instruct each person in fulfilling himself/herself personally, professionally and financially. It also directs them to better understand the nature of his/her approach to prospects or clients, but from their perspective. It shows how to cultivate a positive, harmonious and lasting relationship with everyone he/she contacts; which will be profitable to the professional and the people he/she serves or desire to serve.

SBI seminars emphasizes that achieving potential in life is not reserved for the talented, or the person with the high I.Q.; and that it is not in the gift of birth, and it is not always in ability, or in the best equipment. The person who is successful in achieving his/her potential is almost totally dependent on drive and persistence, which is rooted in positive attitude, self-image, goal-setting, and motivation.

Senator DENTON. Thank you very much, Mr. Williams.

I will address Sister Symons first, but please feel free to comment on these questions.

How do you go about identifying these individuals, Sister, whom you call natural helpers?

Sister SYMONS. There are a lot of ways to do that. First of all, we have had periods of research in the Julie Community Center and in the Task Force, when we interviewed people on a door-to-door basis. One way to find that out is to ask: "When you are in trouble, who do you turn to?" Ask them. People do give you names.

The other way is that, in our common everyday experience with people in the neighborhood, we become aware of the people that people turn to. Also as we conduct programs, we have more people come in that fit into this category of the natural helper.

There are still some natural helpers that we don't always find, but the easiest way is simply to ask people in the community.

Senator DENTON. At this point I want to make clear something that haunts me. I think that there are more heroes and heroines than ever in the history of this country that I know. I am not denegrating the quality of our youth, but considering situations that have come and gone, they have done a whole lot better than I would have done, I would guess. But I remember in some of the hearings in here regarding voluntary programs in which the aged were involved, the point was made that older people seem to be more willing to volunteer and to help and get involved in these programs, and I don't know whether you are all familiar with the RSVP, and the rest. I wonder if it's simply a question of age, or is it just a result of the experiences which they have gone through, such as the depression, World War II, that sort of thing, so that they are more conscious of self-help and what they themselves can do to help others; whereas, children born into a so-called Great Society welfare state, where the emphasis is on the Government to do these things are not at a disadvantage. It's not just an age thing, it's an epoch thing, an era thing in which the conditioning of the two groups has been different psychologically.

I just make that observation for the record.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Could I comment?

Senator DENTON. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is, with youth especially, youth today feel someone will do for them, and this is not restricted to just the poor, and the minorities. Emphasis not placed on, within the educational system, of the value of contributing your time for something that you can grow intrinsically as a result of giving.

I find, it is intrinsic development which is basically missing today in working with young people. The desire to want to give of yourself to a church, school, or to a community is not prominent. There are very few goals in this area today, which encourages one to give a part of one's self back to the community; to work with young people; or to work with older people, and this is not entirely the fault of the young people. I believe it is something which permeates our society today, something within us that we are not willing to give of ourselves to someone else. I don't think this is a deliberate attempt. I just think we have become very callous in our dealing with each other—man to man—woman to woman—or man to woman.

Sister SYMONS. I would like to concur with that and perhaps to clarify a little bit, too. From my experience, I would agree that the people who are the primary helpers are the older members of the community. We find that very much in Southeast Baltimore. But I think that there is something that results from our educational system, and when I talk about our educational system, I am talking about all of the things that educate us which include: the media, television, and the billboards.

There is a basic philosophy that is at work in our country which is one of individualism and we do not really help people to look at themselves in the context of the family or of the community or even of the nation—or as a nation to see ourselves within a world context, as a member of the global community.

So we are very much oriented to what we can get out of this for ourselves. Then too, we are bombarded with the whole philosophy of consumerism and we are confronted with the notion that the only way I am going to be happy is if I have things.

Senator DENTON. Consumerism is predicated on elevation of the standard of "enjoyment."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Senator DENTON. A waiter when he leaves you with a meal says, "Enjoy." We talk about eating rice to fill our bellies here as if that is a really bad thing that we have to resort to. There are hundreds of millions of people in this world who would love to have a bowl of rice. They would not be told by the waiter "enjoy." It is more of "Here's your necessity. Eat, and thank God for it."

We have become, I think, because of our affluence, preoccupied with the development of ourselves in luxuries and forget that which is required to sustain our capacity to provide necessities and if we keep going this way, I am not optimistic.

But I try not to get into that.

To what extent are the services of the neighborhood and family services project truly center coordinated with other social service programs in your area?

Sister SYMONS. I think one of the things that I have tried to point out particularly in the longer testimony is that we have worked side by side with the agencies in the area. One of the things that did happen in our own program was the development of the professional advisory committees which brought in representatives from all of the leading service agencies whether from Federal, city, or State funded programs, or whether from private foundations, hospitals, and so forth. So we have worked side by side with the agencies in almost every project we have undertaken. Even in our picnic, the agency people got out to help organize games and stands and booths and were available to make families aware of the services being offered to the people.

That is a more effective use of agencies because they get to people that they don't otherwise reach when dealing with clients on a one-to-one basis.

Senator DENTON. You have mentioned asking people what bugs them. You're in the trenches dealing with some basic social problems. What do you see as the principal threat facing today's family, recognizing that you have already stated many things in that direction such as the philosophy of self-indulgence rather than recognition of obligations and so forth?

How would the family, which would develop these consciousnesses, be most threatened today by the educational inputs that you mentioned?

Sister SYMONS. Yes; I think education is the key thing here. I feel that we really are inadequate in our educational system, and at the same time, that we have both formally and informally educated people to false values. I have been a formal educator myself.

Senator DENTON. What can we do besides wring our hands? I am in total agreement with you, but what as a Senator could I do to improve the likelihood that role models in terms of individuals, principals in terms of efficacious standards on television and in education be improved?

Sister SYMONS. I guess I keep coming back to the whole question of the basic philosophy that we are being bombarded with. Even when the schools offer particular programs oriented to certain values, people are confronted by values that are conflicting. So we've got to think deeply about our American system and really examine what we are trying to promote and trying to advocate.

Senator DENTON. Who is going to lead and enforce the abdication of that, and when I say enforce, I don't mean force. Simply apply a more positive input. Would it be Government, would it be religion, or what would it be?

Sister SYMONS. Again it's a complex thing and it has to come from many levels. One thing that I think is important is to go to the communities themselves and let them begin to identify their own needs and their own directions. I think a lot of answers are there within the community.

Whatever Government can do to support policies that enable families and neighborhoods to take more direction in terms of their own lives, I think, is important.

Senator DENTON. I am sure that you lament the budget cuts.

Sister SYMONS. Very much.

Senator DENTON. You would probably agree though with the federalism-type approach by which you're trying to do this, trying to decentralize the origination of the concerns and the methods of dealing with them and maybe save enough money in eliminating the in-between, or the Federal, so you don't eliminate that much at the bottom.

I'll admit there will be a difficult transitional question here but I think the direction is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In addition to that, part of the problem is that normally there is always that nationally known black figure who supposedly can speak for a nation of blacks. That is a mystique as far as I am concerned. Those persons who are based in Chicago, or based in New York, while no one is based in Mobile, cannot legitimately speak for me. What I am saying and conveying, instead of these across-the-board national plans and programs for the poor or minorities, that the representatives of the people from their area, within their State, within their particular region, be given the opportunity to be heard, instead of always going to local elected officials, or, in my case, going to that national "black leader," or that local organization that has all of the answers. It takes time to really explore real areas of concern and need locally, which represents a cross-section of all of the people. Usually people who are sequestered—and this even extends down to jury selection—are people who are more often handpicked for their social involvement, rather than their legitimate concern for justice or the poor and minorities. That is the key which is causing great concern, especially among minorities today, there is a national across-the-board program for all minorities and for all the poor.

Senator DENTON. And for all blacks as you said.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Right.

Senator DENTON. It's absurb to have a single uniform concept there.

What success are you enjoying, Mr. Williams, with your relatively new organization in Mobile? Are you reasonably satisfied concerning the use of your organization there that you have some prospect for making the kind of input and getting the kind of emphasis you hope for?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The prospects are great. I am already working out of the area into Tennessee and into Georqia.

In Mobile, I am very concerned about a lot of people out of work. For instance, the welfare reform program comes to an end September 30, and there will be at least 120 people out of a job (CETA/EOPP) and some of them are very talented people. What I need to survive, as a firm, is a duplication of effort, the ability to have a staff of 6, 7, 10, 12, 15, or 16 people who can go and really hear what people say about their needs and development programs accordingly. That is my limitation in Mobile right now, and to hire some of those persons who will be unemployed in a few weeks would be to everyone's advantage. When I talk of Sun Belt Institute, I am talking about a guy who is the founder and president and who is limited because I only have two part-time secretaries.

What we are trying to do is to grow so that we can pull from every segment of the community regardless of color, regardless of age and really go in and become a private sounding board for what people really want. What has happened in federally funded programs, and a lot of nonprofit programs, no one has the responsibility to really report the program's achievements. It is not like a business, and this is my point. All they do is return to the Federal bureaucracy for increased funding to do the same thing they did the year before, and no one knows how many people were actually assisted, or how many people really moved out into the private sector for employment. For 20 years I have worked with social programs, beginning with the Archbishop Toolen Anti-Poverty Committee in Mobile, the first in the State of Alabama to be funded. There were people in need of assistance when I first wrote that program for Archbishop Toolen, and they are still receiving help. That was 20 years ago. In fact, few things have changed except multiple program funding. So, what have we really done.

I am saying, small neighborhood businesses which have potential for growth, and which can be held accountable are needed, and the Government can then say, we expect certain things; what's your projections; how many people will you serve? Then come back to me next year, and your funding—I don't mean funding—but how we support you, and we are talking about morally, not only financially, will depend upon your records. These federally funded programs, all we are doing is hiring a lot of people who left one job to go to another job and the funds did not trickle down as in the case of the latchkey children the adoption witness was talking about. It has not trickled down to where it really should go. It's being stopped in the bureaucracy of people whose sole idea is to keep a job. If there were no welfare participants we wouldn't even need social workers, so why should the social worker get people off welfare, which will do what? Kick him out of a job. That's one of the things to be concerned about.

Senator DENTON. Neither you nor I would like to categorize all government workers that way.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, no, that's right.

Senator DENTON. But there is undoubtedly a propensity for temptation to become institutionalized, dispassionate and not quite as spontaneous as you and your groups are. We are aware of that.

I think we are all in agreement, every witness who has been here today along with this Chairman, that we may have eliminated some poverty but as you just pointed out, these persons under the program of Archbishop Toolen who began 20 years ago are still being helped. We are not doing some thing like eliminating disincentives to work, we are not going to the business of giving the guy the fish and pole and teaching him how to fish rather than giving him the fish.

It seems to me if we give attention to many of these principles without being simplistic and cruel in the way we transition them from one philosophy to another, that we will at least be proceeding properly.

Do you have something to add?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I was not condemning all federally funded programs.

Senator DENTON. I just wanted to make that clear, and I knew you weren't.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There are some things that take place on the local level and other areas that really slow a lot of effective programs down, and more or less do not really encourage the participants to participate and work towards their goals, I should say their self-esteem.

Senator DENTON. Or fullest potential.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And that's self-development.

Sister SYMONS. One of the things I would like to add to this particular conversation comes from my experience of seeking funding for programs. People are always looking for quantitative results, e.g. like how many people are seen. But there is very little attempt to reinforce, support or even to be concerned about qualitative results.

I find it very difficult to get funding for our health education program simply because it is something that is longer term, and the results are not so easily measured. We are working with people, trying to help them learn more about their own health and how can they help other people within the neighborhood. Funding sources want more immediate results like putting a bandage on and treating people for specific illnesses. We are much more ready to fund programs which do that.

Senator DENTON. Yes, I understand.

Sister SYMONS. There are funding programs for projects that have a time frame and that provide immediate concrete results, but again we are back to an educational question, I believe.

Senator DENTON. Yes, and I believe that the issue of welfare reform needs to be addressed in an integrated fashion, and the difficulty I found as I arrived up here, having studied some of the welfare problems in my own State, is that it is not possible by the normal legislative process to undertake welfare reform because no one committee has full purview over the entire spectrum of issues concerning that.

You know we have Agriculture, Finance, and other committees with some jurisdictional claim over issues of welfare reform. But we are trying to at least gather information which we hope other committees will consider and that we will jointly undertake over the years, as well as I hope within the next few months, to at least begin addressing welfare reform in an integrated way rather than piece by piece which never works out.

At least that's what I am told by developments from the past. I would like to thank you very much, Sister Symons, and Mr. Williams. It's high noon and it's high time we brought these hearings to a halt. This concludes our testimony. This hearing of the Subcommittee on Aging, Family and Human Services is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12 noon, the subcommittee adjourned to the call of the Chair.]

○